LEVEL ONE

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

January, 1923 Vol. XII No. 5

Editorial Comment 339
General Convention and the Concordat—The Bishops on Reservation—Catholic and Evangelical—Proportional Representation in the Church—Local Self-Government in the Church—Why the War Came—Why Christian Science Appeals.

The Position of Women in the Church 348
The Bishop of Southern Florida

Protestant Unity 353
Frederick Sherman Arnold

Catholic Tendencies in the American Lutheran Church 358
Arthur Gregory Marcell

Nocturne 363
Marshall M. Day

The Use of God as the Giver of Work 367
Fleming James

The Quakers 375
Hamilton Schuyler

Memoirs of a Parson's Daughter 382
Filia

A Confessor on the Mystical Life 389
Translated from the French by a Sister of St. Mary

Monseigneur Duchesne and Modernism 394
Cecil Roberts

Book Reviews 398

Books Received 415

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under act of March 3, 1879.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., New York, N. Y.

Annual Subscription, $3.00

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

Creeds or No Creeds?

By the REV. CHARLES HARRIS, author of "Pro Fide, etc." $6.00.

A CRITICAL examination of the basis of modernism from the standpoint of a liberal orthodox realist of the Oxford type, a psychologist strongly anti-Freudian.

"This book seems to me quite the most valuable contribution recently made to the literature of Apologetics. It is a thorough treatment of 'Modernism,' and its thoroughness is precisely what distinguishes it from other books on the criticism of 'Modernism.' We have many books, some of them very valuable, treating of special questions that the modernists have raised; but Dr. Harris deals with Modernism as a whole. This is a splendid piece of clear thinking."—Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D.

A New Bible Commentary for Teachers and Bible Students

"Dr. Smith's series of handbooks entitled THE BIBLE FOR SCHOOL AND HOME are just what many a Pastor, Superintendent, and Teacher has been looking for. They are especially adapted for Week-Day Schools of Religion and Vacation Bible Schools. They are so simple and attractive that they are fascinating not only to teachers but to interested Bible students who care to read them through."—*Marion Lawrence, Consulting General Secretary, International Sunday School Association.*

THE BIBLE FOR SCHOOL AND HOME

Rev. J. Paterson Smyth, D.D., Litt.D., D.C.L.

Vol. I. The Book of Genesis.
Vol. II. Moses and the Exodus.
Vol. III. Joshua and the Judges.
Vol. IV. The Prophets and the Kings.

12mo. Each Net, $1.25

At Your Religious Book Store

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY
Publishers in America for Hodder & Stoughton
244 Madison Avenue, New York

Modern Inquiry Series

A Grammar of Belief

A Revaluation of the Bases of Christian Belief in the Light of Modern Science and Philosophy. By CHARLES LEMUEL DIBBLE. Paper, $1.00. Leatherette, $1.50.

This little book is the first of a series issued under the direction of the National Student Council of the Church, Rev. Paul Micou, secretary. It is intended for the use of classes or discussion groups of students. The separate divisions are given in syllabus form, making perfectly clear what the author's views are, and yet giving plenty of room for discussion. Each discussion centers around some "problem" clearly stated after the author has aroused interest in it.

The book covers the entire range of religion, and the Christian religion in particular as our Church has received it, and shows the valuable contributions made to it by the modern physical sciences, by psychology, and by philosophy. Students troubled by the supposed conflict between science and religion will find themselves reassured by the discussions.

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO. **Milwaukee, Wis.**

LEADING ORGAN *of the* AMERICAN CHURCH

The . . .
American Church
· Monthly ·

SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, D.D., EDITOR

The purpose of the *American Church Monthly* is to set forth the cause of the Catholic religion in the Anglican communion, and particularly in the American Episcopal Church. It does not profess to be a forum of debate in which all the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith may be assailed. It does not profess to represent all schools of thought in the Episcopal Church. Its aim is to present constructively the Catholic view on matters of faith, order, discipline, and worship. On minor matters which have not been authoritatively settled, opportunity is given for the expression of divergent opinions. The class of readers kept in view comprises the more intelligent among the clergy and laity who have a serious intellectual interest in the problems of religion and life. It does not aim to be a magazine exclusively for scholars; but neither does it aim to appeal to the unthinking, who never read anything but the more sensational of the daily newspapers.

Sixth Year Subscription $3.00 Sample 25c

FACTS ABOUT CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Rt. Rev. Cameron Mann, D.D., is Missionary Bishop of Southern Florida.

Rev. Frederick Sherman Arnold, M.A., S.T.B., lives in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Rev. Arthur Gregory Marcell is pastor of the Lutheran Church in Johnson City, N. Y.

Rev. Marshall M. Day is rector of Grace Church, Muncie, Indiana.

Rev. Fleming James, Ph.D., has the Chair of Old Testament History and Literature at the Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn.

Rev. Hamilton Schuyler is rector of Trinity Church, Trenton, N. J.

The American Church Monthly

A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

NEW YORK, N. Y.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.
Vice-President: HON. WILLIAM J. TULLY, Corning, N. Y.
Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York
Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Three Dollars a Year — Twenty-five Cents a Copy
Canadian subscription, $3.25 a Year — Foreign subscription, $3.50 a Year

Vol. XII — JANUARY, 1923 — No. 5

EDITORIAL COMMENT

General Convention and the Concordat

DOUBTLESS under our peculiar system General Conventions are a necessary evil and have to be endured. We could wish, however, that instead of meeting triennially, sessions might be held at less frequent intervals, say not oftener than every decade. If that were the case we are inclined to believe that the cause of true religion among us would suffer no serious harm while the Church would be spared much hasty legislation. Moreover, the clergy and others interested would have an opportunity in the meanwhile to acquaint themselves fully with what had been accomplished at one Convention before the next one was held. As it is now, no sooner has the knowledge of the actions of one Convention been half assimilated before another is held and the process has immediately to be repeated at the risk of causing a great strain upon delicate digestive organs. More-

over, if General Conventions met less frequently, presumably they would be better prepared for, and the various committees, joint and otherwise, charged with the duty of preparing the *agenda,* would have time enough to get their reports in shape for final consideration, so that the five hundred deputies when they assembled would know just what the proposals before them involved. As it is, the work of the committee seems to be largely left until the Convention meets and then in the rush and confusion crude and ill-digested legislation relative to important matters is proposed which it would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to unravel. Little time is allowed for debate, immediate decisions are called for and votes taken which do not represent the carefully considered judgment of deputies, but rather a sort of mob impulse. Apparently the most controversial matters are reserved for the closing days, and the result too often is that measures are adopted that satisfy no one and are often contradictory in their various parts if not vicious in their implications.

For instance, the Canon dealing with the Concordat seems to be a jumble of inept phrasing, unworkable where it is not revolutionary and likely to prove totally unacceptable to those whom it was designed to conciliate. Dr. E. A. White, the learned chairman of the House Committee on Canons, is reported to have said that he deemed it "so prejudicial to the interests of the Church, so clearly unconstitutional, that the hasty adoption of this ill-considered Canon would retard the movement towards unity." Having never favored the idea of the Concordat or believed that it would be possible to frame a measure that would at one and the same time conserve the principles of Holy Orders and meet the approval of the Congregationalists, we confess to feeling no great regret over the outcome. If the repudiation of this Canon by the Congregationalists shall have the effect of postponing any further attempts along this line for twenty years, we shall not be sorry. We sympathize with the Congregationalists, or rather with the little group of distinguished persons among them who have suffered such a rebuff to their well-intentioned advances, and we are also mortified that the Church through the General Convention should have made such a *faux pas* in a matter that called for the most delicate handling. Otherwise we are unmoved.

The Bishops on Reservation

THE report of a committee of the House of Bishops on the subject of reservation of the Blessed Sacrament was presented in the last General Convention by the chairman of the committee, the Bishop of Vermont. The main recommendation of the report seems to place the responsibility upon the bishop of the diocese. If he wishes to authorize what the committee calls " deviation from the strict law " he apparently may do so, but the committee wishes it understood that this does not cover the authorization of the use of the Sacrament so reserved for services of worship or benediction.

There is one hopeful sign in this report, a sign of progress, in the view as to what constitutes the primitive Church, to which appeal has so often been made by Anglicans. Heretofore we have had it dinned into our ears repeatedly that the primitive Church was the Church of the first six centuries. Whatever that Church permitted or authorized was sacrosanct and infallible, but anything that happened after the sixth century was to be regarded with grave suspicion. This committee has extended the period of unblemished Catholicity by at least four centuries, as appears from the following paragraph:

> For over a thousand years, while the Church undoubtedly believed in the Real Presence, no cultus of this sort was permitted or authorized. Our appeal in this, as in all matters, is Scripture and Antiquity, and these give no warrant for the practices which, in the Roman Catholic Church alone, have in later times been developed.

In the paragraph preceding the one we have just quoted the committee makes an extraordinary statement which implies that the Anglican Church can have nothing to do with any development of doctrine which came about in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Here are the words:

> Reservation of the Sacrament in the sacristy of the church, that it might always be ready for administration in case of need, became the established rule in both Eastern and Western Christendom. Devotional use of the Sacrament apart from communion only came in along with or following Latin developments of doctrine in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

This is an astounding proposition, that developments of doctrine which took place in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when the Anglican Church was a part of Western Christendom, are to

be regarded as Latin developments. Surely they were just as much accepted in England as in any other part of the Western Church. Why should the Holy Spirit have suddenly ceased to function in the Western Church at the year 1000? There is some justification for designating any developments which took place in the Roman Catholic Church after the Reformation as Latin developments, but what took place before the Reformation was no more a Latin development than it was an English development.

We find it very difficult to believe in any theory of the Church which holds that the work of the Holy Spirit in leading us to a full understanding of the Christian revelation suddenly ceased at the end of the third century or the sixth or the tenth. We believe that the Holy Spirit is still working in the Church leading us into all truth.

Catholic and Evangelical

WE are indebted to Dean Laine of the Cathedral in Portland, Maine, for calling our attention to a very interesting pronouncement by an eminent English political leader which appeared in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* of October 6, 1922. We are glad to give the quotation here in full, as it expresses an opinion to which we can subscribe most heartily. We regret that Dean Laine has not enlightened us as to the name of this English layman. The paragraph is as follows:

I heard a speech at a recent Anglo-Catholic meeting which struck me as extraordinarily valuable and timely. The speaker pleaded for the disuse of the misleading terms " High " and " Low " in Church matters. He said we wanted things today which would bring all men of good will together, and as no man could possibly be at once High and Low, such terms tended to separate. But if we used instead of High and Low the words Catholic and Evangelical, then the man who laid great stress on the individual and personal aspects of religion would call himself an Evangelical, and the man who recognized the importance of the corporate and social aspects of religion would glory in the title of Catholic. And as no man, thinking seriously, would deny the importance of either aspect we should soon, he declared, all recognize that we are all both Evangelical and Catholic, though one might call himself a very Catholic Evangelical and another a very Evangelical Catholic. This, of course, is perfectly true. No one, for instance, could have denied the name of

Evangelical to the late Canon Body. And many of our prominent Evangelical leaders are in the truest sense of the word Catholic. While there are many men there will be, in religion, as in other things, many minds. Reckless imputations of dishonesty and disloyalty to vows never yet advanced the cause of truth one iota. Cannot we all try to face the tremendous problems which confront us in a better spirit?

Proportional Representation in the Church

NO more hypocritical plan ever was urged among us than the plea for "proportional representation." This plea was even hypocritical in phrase. "Proportional Representation" in American political life means the representation of minorities. As used in our Church discussions it meant the empowering of a domineering and insolent majority with the proxies of a defeated, but numerous, minority.

Were delegates to diocesan convention really representative of the people of the parishes, the *plebs Christiana,* the proposition might have been termed democratic. Since lay delegates are generally the men of wealth, the proposition was plutocratic.

Instead of our present equality of dioceses, looked upon as spiritually equal, it was proposed to give a larger vote to those dioceses where the concentration of wealth went hand in hand with the concentration of population, so that the power and the votes were controlled by the wealth. At the same time, the large and protesting minorities in these very dioceses were to be counted to swell the power they abhorred, while their votes were suppressed by the majority.

Before one talks of reform or representation one must face the peculiar and undemocratic make-up of diocesan conventions and vestries. Perhaps those who face these problems will conclude that our present system is the best possible, all the different circumstances considered.

Local Self-Government in the Church

IF any reform of our constitution were to be discussed, why would it not be well to give the provinces of this Church a vote on changes in the constitution and Prayer Book? Retaining all the present procedure and safe-guards, would it not be wise to enact that such constitutional changes must be carried affirmatively by every province of this Church? America is too

large a country for centralization. A province is large enough to be entrusted with a veto on changes in the constitution and Prayer Book, and that in addition to all our present safe-guards. After that, there would no longer be reason to fear any mistakes short of a general apostasy. That of course could not be guarded against in any way.

Some Catholics will object: but then the South will block all progress! What of it? You can trust the true old South to block heresy. If you can't persuade the South that changes are wise, ought you to have the changes? The Southern Province is a pretty big place. Has this Church a right to move without it? Irritating as Virginia Churchmanship has sometimes been, we believe there is real loyalty to the Incarnate Life in Virginia. We think we can trust Virginia and still more, the South as a whole.

Is not local self-government a principle even more important than democracy? Certainly it is more American than democracy and more Churchly. Is it not the principle of safety in a country as large as ours?

Why the War Came

IT is a matter of common observation that the aftermath of the great war has found the world in a state of bitter disillusionment. A chaos intellectual, moral and economic followed quickly upon the declaration of peace and the generous impulses which accompanied our entrance into the conflict have been succeeded by a wide-spread apathy, cynical indifference and even despair as to the future. We are convinced that the settlement reached at Paris has really settled nothing, at least permanently, and that the problem of a just and stable peace remains yet to be solved. It is well to remember however that the war only accentuated evil conditions and brought them to a climax. For at least twenty years before the outbreak there were plain indications that something was radically wrong with the world. We can all see it now even if during the period which preceded the war it was not apparent. The process of disintegration was gradually going on, moral and spiritual values were being discounted, religion was being neglected and educa-

tion and the arts were being divorced from any high ideals. Materialism was rampant, false political ideas were being fostered and the mad scramble for wealth and the unconscionable quest for luxury and for pleasure obliterated the vision for the finer and purer things of life.

The great world war came, as we are just now beginning to understand, not because one nation only was the aggressor, but because over a series of years racial and national hatreds and jealousies had been permitted to grow up unchecked. All the nations, our own included, had been transgressing the immutable laws of righteousness. At bottom it was the fact of sin, terrible corporate sin, shared in greater or less degree by all, that brought upon the world this awful scourge, of which we are today suffering the aftermath in the collapse which has come in all countries and in all departments of life.

The thing that will save the world and civilization is plainly not peace treaties or leagues of nations but a profound conviction by all that the seat of disease is found in a moral obliquity. There must be a real repentance for the past, an acknowledgment on the part of each national group that it has sinned and done amiss, that each and all have violated the moral laws of God, by which laws it is required that men should love one another and that the strong should bear the infirmities of the weak. If the Christian people of all lands in the years before the outbreak of the great war had given themselves faithfully to the task of inculcating in their several communities the spirit of Christ's teaching as set forth in The Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere they might have saved the world from this catastrophe. It is because Christian people everywhere through religious apathy, worldliness and spiritual blindness evaded their duty as expressed in the saying "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you"—it is because of such universal failure that the forces of evil prevailed when the great crisis came. There is no panacea for the world's terrible plight today, no hope for the avoidance of similar disasters in the future save as the spirit of Christ comes in the hearts of men and teaches them to hate war and to avoid the causes which produce it.

Why Christian Science Appeals

ONE of the best treatments of Christian Science we have seen is to be found in a recent book by a Roman Catholic writer, A. M. Bellwald, S.M., S.T.L., entitled "Christian Science and the Catholic Faith." Fr. Bellwald is particularly lucid in his analysis of the causes of the apparent success of Christian Science. He gives especial prominence to two causes. The first is that it offers a certain amount of psycho-therapy, or mind healing, which, though its theory may be wrong, is often sound in fact. These cures, which are due to the application of sound psychological principles that are not by any means peculiar to Christian Science, are commonly accepted by the people as a proof that the religious views of this system are true. This, of course, does not necessarily follow. The other cause of its success is a vague sort of mysticism. In a world that is weary of materialism, with the natural craving for God so cruelly suppressed, people welcome any new philosophy of life which speaks to them of "Life", "Truth", and "Love". Christian Science insists upon the divine indwelling in the human soul. Men who are hungry for some kind of mystical religion will grasp at any such teaching as this, so long as nothing better is brought before them.

The rapid rise and development of Christian Science is an excellent illustration of one kind of harm that was done by the Protestant Reformation. In breaking away from the Catholic religion men devised various substitutes for the old religion and in doing so invariably omitted or denied some of its fundamental principles. After going on for several centuries with a truncated religion considerable numbers of these Protestants have revolted from the religion of their fathers and have evolved new forms of religion which emphasize the old Catholic principles which their fathers had discarded. This is true not only of Christian Science, but of Unitarianism, Quakerism, New Thought, and many other modern cults. It is not surprising, therefore, that in Protestant circles Christian Science should gain many converts, because Protestants, knowing nothing of the Catholic religion from personal experience, are unaware that the very principles which Christian Science emphasizes

have always been taught in their fullness and true proportion in the ancient historic Church of Christ. We suppose, however, that the process must go on. Protestant denominations will continue to disintegrate and out of their ruins will arise new religious bodies which emphasize the truth which they have neglected. While all along through the ages the Catholic Church goes on teaching the whole counsel of God! It is pathetic, is it not?

The Position of Women in the

Councils and Ministrations of the Church

Rt. Rev. Cameron Mann, D.D.,
Bishop of Southern Florida.

TO determine the proper place and functions of women in the Church would seem to require a prior determination of what a woman is, as distinct from a man, and whether that distinction is one of organic importance.

For such determination we can resort to three authorities,—Science, History and Revelation.

From Science we gain little light. The biologists and psychologists are confusing and contradictory in their pronouncements on the most serious questions of sex and its results. As the "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics" states, "Widely divergent views have been held as to the origin of the family."

That there are *two* sexes is equally evident to the scientist and "the man in the street." And the scientist knows that these two sexes exist in the earliest forms of living creatures, and are possibly latent in each vegetable and animal cell. And the higher the rise in the scale of being the greater the difference between male and female, till it culminates in humanity.

But nowhere is the difference one of genus or species. The staminate and pistillate date-palms are all Phoenix; the lion and the lioness are both Leo; a man and a woman are each Homo.

There is not a quality or power in the human male which cannot be found to some degree in the human female.

So far as Science teaches, the differences of sex avail mainly for the reproduction of the kind, and a woman's distinction from a man is like that of a pistil from a stamen.

Therefore to talk of women's peculiar place and tasks in any social organization is futile. Women and men alike may aspire to whatever work they prefer, and may hold whatever positions they can attain. Due care being taken for child-bearing, the woman is free to choose any occupation and to put her bodily and mental strength into it.

That appears to be the verdict of Science.

From this verdict history largely dissents. On the whole, the past ages show solid barriers between spear-side and spindle-side.

True, there are not a few cases where a woman undertook a man's task, and was applauded for her success. But these cases were exceptional, and were felt to be so by the woman herself. As Joan of Arc pathetically said, "*Je sais bien que batailler n'est pas mon ouvrage.*"

Our retrospect upon the noblest civilizations shows the women by the cradles and the men in the street, the women in the parlors and the men in the forums. And the fine old proverb runs "*Ubi uxor ibi domus.*"

If we are guided simply by the voice of History, the position of women in the Church is easily settled. It is that of worshippers in the congregations, teachers and nurses in the schools and hospitals, writers in books and magazines. It is not in the pulpits, nor at the altar, nor in the synod hall.

But to this verdict of History exception can be taken. After all it only states how things have been, not how they must or should be. Professors Geddes and Thomson say, in their book entitled "Sex", "We are not in sympathy with those who dogmatize on what they call the fit and proper lines of feminine evolution. Who can tell what men or women can do effectively until a fair trial has been made? Social evolution is an experimental art."

Moreover, at the present time we see many States wiping out the ancient lines of sexual division in the work of the world. The woman may engage in any business, vote at any election, become candidate for any office. She stands out an individual under no more legal restraints and limitations than a man.

So it is asked whether the Church had not better follow the example of the State. If a woman can be member of Congress and Parliament, why not member of Convocation and Council? If she can be a Judge, why not a Bishop?

It would seem that neither Science nor History answers such questions with a sweeping negative.

Much as bodily differences of sex *suggest* that there must be mental and spiritual differences equipping for different social functions; much as the poetry of the past is seen to issue

from homes where wives and mothers abode intent on household duties; yet neither the surmise nor the vision can be safely relied on to justify prohibition of women's starting out on new enterprises and colonizing hitherto untrodden lands.

However, there is a third teacher to be consulted—Revelation.

The only reason for the Christian Church is the belief that there has been and is a Word of God,—a divine disclosure of the paramount laws and eternal lines for human life, individual and social,—and that the Church is the custodian and proclaimer of that Word. We believe that Jesus Christ declared the essential facts and relations of the human race. We believe He commissioned His Church to carry His revelation down the ages unchanged and unchangeable.

No matter what theories we may hold as to the limitations imposed by the Incarnation, those limitations cannot be supposed to have stifled our Lord's knowledge of the nature of humanity, nor to have made His teaching about fundamental facts either partial or temporary.

Now there can be no doubt as to the attitude of Jesus Christ towards the sex-division of humanity. He accepted the Genesis Story,—be it history, allegory, or myth,—as truly declaring the *family* to be the social unit. He saw the dualism of " male " and " female " and the monism of " one flesh ". He endorsed the man's headship of the family, while insisting on the woman's indissoluble partnership in it.

In His teaching and intercourse He drew no sex lines. He talked to women, made friends of women, accepted women's help, just as he did with men. And this, be it observed, to the surprise of His contemporaries; He was not following the conventions of the land and day. It is certain that to Him a woman was as complete an intellectual and spiritual being as was a man.

In the final estimate the distinctions of sex utterly vanished for Him. When St. Paul says " There is no male and female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus ", he seems to recall that saying of the Lord, quoted by the two Clements, that " the male would be with the female, neither male nor female ", and

the other saying that in the next world there will be " neither marrying nor giving in marriage ".

But when the Lord chose the Apostles who were to be His successors, the heralds of His Gospel and the officers of His Kingdom, He chose men exclusively. Which is the more significant because women were *unofficially* the first to proclaim His resurrection, and women became members of His Church on strict equality with men, by the same baptism and eucharist.

But always His attitude and words and arrangements imply the monogamous family, with the man as its head, and the Catholic Church with men as its apostles.

We learn this quite clearly from the four Gospels. But we learn it even more clearly from what His Kingdom was in its earliest days. We are not obliged to quote St. Mark or St. John or St. Paul. We need only observe the invariable tradition of the Primitive Church, which we must believe was following His rule.

Should it be argued that Jesus in His treatment of Sex simply conformed to the social environment of His age, then He would cease to be a supreme authority for us in any matter—how could we tell but that *all* his utterances were swayed by that environment, to become obsolete when circumstances changed?

But, if we accept His teaching as a Revelation, the true light for every age, then it is clear that in His Church the *authority,*—in preaching, in conduct of worship, in ministration of sacraments, in ordination of officers, belongs to men only.

This does not mean that to men is given all the *power* in the Church.

I need not dwell on the enormous influence of women in all lands and every age. It is a constant theme of song and tale and jest. The Greek statesman, pointing to his little boy as the strongest person in Greece,—" for he rules his mother, she rules me, and I rule Athens ",—is as modern a character as he is ancient.

In many a parsonage the wife is the dominant personality. In many a See-house, also,—as Mrs. Proudie is an example in realistic fiction. Or we may go further, and observe the great

ladies who, to quote Father Purcell, "canvassed or cajoled" at the Vatican Council.

This feminine power must be frankly confessed, should be cordially welcomed, and may well be provided with more direct and visible channels for its movement.

Only, we cannot allow any such reversal of the family order as implies that the dominant woman is simply another and dominant man.

We may not be able to define precisely what womanhood is; but we can insist that it exists and has its peculiar place in the family.

To sum up briefly;—in all ecclesiastical matters, where the sole requisites are talent and training, women should be freely allowed to take such action as they will and can. But in all ecclesiastical matters where the value of the action depends on a *commission*,—action representing the Church as a Body, *family* action,—men only should be ordained to lead and to preside.

It is a local issue, to be settled by local Churches, whether women shall serve in vestries, diocesan conventions, and provincial synods, and whether so serving they shall sit in the same house with the men or in a house of their own.

But the Church Catholic has decided,—and its decision must not be repealed,—that women cannot become priests or bishops, cannot receive the commission to represent the Church.

In declaring this we ought to state unequivocally that it is not because of women's inferiority in body, mind or spirit. Many women are physically and mentally stronger than many men; and, as Thomas Aquinas says, "*Sexus non est in anima.*" The subordination is simply to maintain the ideal of the human family, as revealed and sanctioned by Jesus Christ.

If our Church will make it very plain that this is her fixed conviction and conclusion, not merely will her own daughters gladly accord, but she will gain daughters from afar.

Even in these days,—when there are convulsive efforts to overthrow the established order of the world,—there are multitudes who will rejoice to greet a full, ungrudging welcome to women's work in the Church, accompanied by a full, fearless insistence on women's place in the order of the Church,—will rejoice to greet an unswerving maintenance of the Christian ideal of the Family.

Protestant Unity

Rev. Frederick Sherman Arnold, M. A., S. T. B.

THERE are two principal arguments for Church unity, a religious and a financial argument. The religious argument is based on the great, high-priestly prayer:

> "That they all may be one: as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." (St. John XVII, 21.)

The financial argument is based on the waste and consequent poverty occasioned by the effort to maintain from six to a dozen churches in every little village and town and the similar divisions of Protestant religious effort in the cities. Either of these arguments, if the whole weight of it could be brought to bear upon the controversy, would be convincing alone by itself. As it is, the religious argument opens the flood-gates of the sentimentalism, while the financial argument stirs the hardness of the worldly. Neither sentimentalism nor hard business-sense have any place, however, until after we have defined our terms and settled our principles. The text from the great, high-priestly prayer must be taken to mean that it is the will of Christ that the followers should be united.

One can propound at least three questions: who are really followers of Christ? What sort of unity did He mean? And how ought that unity to be brought about? Until these questions are resolved any sentimentalism injected into the subject is both impertinent and misleading. Similar observations apply to the financial argument. It is sensible to organize and save money, but one must first be quite sure of how the money is eventually to be spent. Thus criticized, neither of these arguments has any particular bearing. They call attention to the problem, that is all.

It seems reasonable to all of us that persons with the same general program and principles should unite and it is not less reasonable that persons whose principles and whose practical program are opposed and conflicting should organize separately.

There was a time when the Protestant sects differed on things they considered essential. They have, on the whole, all changed in the same direction. The Broad Church Episcopalian does not believe Episcopacy is a divine, but a human thing; so of Pres-

byterians on Presbyterianism. Congregationalists are willing to discuss the limits of independency. Nobody believes in Calvinism, hence nobody insists on Arminianism. Puritans have forgotten about the rule of the saints. Methodists dance and play cards. Quakers hire paid ministers and use organs. None of the sects believe in Sacraments, least of all, the Sacrament of Orders. The Bible is looked upon as a collection of human documents, in which God is revealed rather more than usually, but where great errors have entered to falsify the tradition. Christ is universally revered as the leader, but doctrinally there is nothing certain and, as to the historic Jesus, the higher criticism leaves little more certainty. The program of all these sects is a higher and clarified worldliness, based on the best current thought, with sentimental reference to Christ.

That these sects should unite is surely sensible and they have begun to unite. In organizations like the Y. M. C. A. they are already practically united for what they consider the most important part of their work. They have, also, the Federation of Churches. This will probably go on drawing the bonds tighter and tighter, until, while the denominations may nominally preserve their identity, we shall have one great national, or perhaps, international organization to represent current Protestantism. The delay in this evolution is caused by the slowly dying elements of former orthodoxy within the denominations; that is, by the slowly vanishing remains of the Catholic tradition.

For be it understood the Episcopalian High Churchmen are not the only school, though they may very well be the most radical and self-conscious school, who hold firmly to what they conceive to be historic Christianity. The Lutheran Churches in the United States hold very high sacramental doctrines and a rigid belief in Scripture. Add to this the general churchliness of their denomination, involved in ornaments, vestments, altars, the prayer-book and the Christian year, and it is a serious question if the Lutheran consciousness is not more Catholic than the Episcopalian consciousness. This will shock some of our High Church readers, but we are, of course, referring to the composite, or average consciousness of the denomination taken as a whole.

The Methodists seem to hold to two great supernatural realities: the miracle of the Incarnation and the individual miracle of Conversion. A Methodist who believes heart and soul that Jesus is God, of one substance with the Father, and who also believes with all the firmness of spiritual experience that he, John Jones, has been miraculously possessed by the Holy Spirit and turned from the world to God:—that kind of a believer, whatever else he lacks, believes in the heart of Catholic Christianity. In all the so-called "orthodox" denominations there are ministers and laymen who believe these things, who believe *ex animo* in the Nicene Creed, who believe in the infallibility of Scripture in faith and morals, and who hold to other survivals of Catholic Christianity. These men, beyond all doubt, stand in the way of a united Protestantism. They may not see clearly, as Anglican Catholics do, how the great unity movement is based on that unconfessional, anti-Catholic, democratic humanitarianism into which current Protestantism has developed. But they feel it and some things they cannot fail to see. They cannot fail to see that in all the articles of confederation or bases of unity that are put forth, doctrinal statements find no place. Such statements of principles as are enunciated in movements for Church unity are so indefinite as to be patient of almost any interpretation. At the Council of Nicea in antiquity, the whole vocabulary of metaphysics was searched to find a word, even if only one word, which no Arian could possibly accept. Quite the opposite of this, modern conferences on Church unity search for language that shall exclude no one. The first is the method of believers who care everything for God. The second is a worldly method that is seeking success and efficiency.

The orthodox remnant in the churches, that has not bowed the knee to success and efficiency, sees this and feels it still more. That is the great obstacle to Protestant unity.

We hope we are wrong, but we think it is a weakening obstacle. Outside of High Church Anglicanism and, perhaps, American Lutheranism, the orthodox remnant in Protestantism seems to us weak indeed. Weak not only in numbers, wealth, social position, and scholarship, but, it seems to us, logically weak beside. What calls itself Unitarianism, what is more truly

to be called a democratic Humanitarianism, is in our opinion the logic of current Protestantism. If that is true, it is likely to prevail. The orthodox remnant will not only be out-voted, but out-argued. The unconfessional, democratic, anti-catholic humanitarianism of current Protestantism will go on until it has absorbed and federated all the Protestant denominations. Then it will also go on doctrinally until it practically arrives at the Unitarian theological position of continental Protestantism and New England. If any of the orthodox remain, there will be no hope for them save to join the High Anglicans, always supposing the High Anglicans succeed in maintaining themselves. If the High Anglicans fail, the last hope of an orthodox and Christian Protestantism will fail.

For the High Anglicans the situation ought to be clear. To allow sentimentalism to obscure it spells ruin. The case of the Lutherans and of individuals here and there should be reserved. Speaking generally, what is called Church unity with Protestants means apostacy and nothing less. It means selling Jesus for money. Current Protestantism is not another aspect of Christianity. It is no more Christianity than Mahommedanism is. It is another religion, if it be a religion. But it is not even so much. It is the organized expression of higher and clarified worldliness.

This is doctrinally so clear that there would be no danger were it not for the human side of the case. These laymen and ministers, who are not fellow Christians at all, are members of our family and of our club, partners in business, social connections, dear friends. We love them personally and some of them we may hate personally, for all one knows, but the college-mate or the near kinsman you hate is nearer to you and, for all your hate, you really prefer his company to the company of most of the Roman Catholics and some of the Anglican Catholics you know. That is why, when we would experiment in Church unity, we begin with the Congregationalists. Of all the sects the Congregationalists are least like us. Of all the American people, except Episcopalians, the Congregationalists are nearly the most agreeable to know personally.

So the movement for unity with this or that group or federation of current American Protestantism has all the allurement

the world can give. Our bodies and our minds go out to the world. It is a terrible temptation that we have all felt. The primitive Church felt it and endured persecution. We do not have to endure much persecution. Perhaps for that very reason the temptation is harder to bear.

While almost every Anglo-Catholic feels this temptation, and the best of us, perhaps, feel it most, the whole Broad Church party is determined to bring about union with Protestants. For a Broad Churchman simply is a Protestant of the current type. Democratic humanitarianism is his religion. There is where the irrepressible conflict really arises. Protestant unity is the rock on which the Anglican communion will split, if it ever breaks at all. When we read the reports of the Unitarian views expressed last September at the Girton Conference, we see how far this movement has got in England. Moreover, Broad Churchmanship shows us that external unity, apostolic orders, a Catholic liturgy and a decent ceremonial are no defense against the current Protestant humanitarianism. Broad Churchmen have all these things, even the extreme Broad Churchmen of the Girton Conference. To suppose there is some magic in ordination which can Christianize unbelievers, is not only irrational, but is confuted by every day experience within the Church.

From the High Anglican point of view unity with Protestants it unity with unbelievers. It is not Church unity, but apostasy. It may be that High Churchmen are a little more Catholic today than they were in the reign of King Charles the First, but the change is not really very great. On the other hand, Protestantism, outside of Anglicanism and even within Anglicanism, has changed utterly. The current Protestantism is a new religion or, rather, a higher and clarified worldliness. The old Protestantism, the faith of our fathers, even our Protestant fathers, is represented today by Anglican High Churchmanship almost alone.

Catholic Tendencies in the American Lutheran Church

Arthur Gregory Marcell

UPON invitation of the Editor I submit the following article. This kind invitation came as a result of a letter which I, as a Lutheran clergyman, wrote him expressing my interest in the Monthly and especially in an article which appeared in the July edition on " American Lutheranism."

The title of this article may be capable of only one interpretation from the Lutheran standpoint. For example " Catholic tendency " in the Lutheran Church as to " doctrine " must be ruled out. We have always held in the main to the " essentials " which were " once for all delivered to the saints." We believe that we have always maintained that body of truth which the Church Universal has always believed as laid down in the Holy Scriptures. Our reformers, we declare, simply corrected the abuses which crept into both the doctrine and the worship of the Church. They added nothing new to any of the Oecumenical creeds or symbols, which, after all, contain the basic fundamentals of the Faith. Our Augsburg Confession contains the " Essentials " of Catholic and Apostolic Faith. Hence it cannot be said that there is any growing Catholic tendency along doctrinal lines in American Lutheranism. The only tendency which is manifesting itself is that which desires that we shall guard and preserve what we hold to be Scriptural and in conformity to the " Historic Faith." In the last analysis, such a tendency always shows a Catholic spirit.

Another example which must not so much be ruled out as explained. That is the matter of the system of polity. We have always held that for the sake of good order and efficiency the " Episcopal system " is perhaps best. It is practiced by our Church in Europe. We hope and pray that it will soon be so in America. We are in some quarters leaning toward it. It is being thought about by many in our Church, and one writer expressed his ardor by saying: " That he hoped the day will soon come when a bishop and a cathedral will be ours in the American Lutheran Church. However, this slight tendency cannot prop-

erly be called Catholic, because it by no means infers the " Catholic System " as held by the Roman and Anglican Communions. For the present no such tendency exists and never will, but perhaps as Father Arnold says of us, " we believe in it." It might be better if such a tendency did exist. Our unnecessary divisions and diversions of practice would be remedied ere the Millenium dawns.

Now, then, one more point remains, namely that of " worship," and as to that we may say that there is a growing tendency which might be called " Catholic " in the American Lutheran Church. It is in this light that the title is to be interpreted.

Perhaps if there is any term which is misunderstood and misrepresented by so many fantastical interpretations, it is the beautiful term " Catholic." And oftentimes great mists of ignorance and misunderstanding have been cleared away by the defining of terms. It is well therefore for the sake of some Lutherans who might perchance read this article to define what is meant by " Catholic tendency " before they go into epileptic spasms at the mere sight of the title. By the term " Catholic Tendency " is meant the growing interest in the things ceremonial which the Church Universal has always observed in her cults. It is a growing love for those things of worship that have been dimmed and disowned by a false, fanatical reformation on the part of several would-be reformers. Deformers would be a better designation. We may call it " Catholic " in tendency because it is only a return to what was always observed and practiced and what was essentially Catholic. It is an exchange of the " coat of many colors " thrust upon us for the " seamless dress " which we have always worn, so to speak. Those beautiful and stately practices that have ever been a part of the Universal Church and have come down to us as precious heritages, are rapidly finding their rightful places among the American Lutheran parishes. The prejudistic spirit is wearing away and we are coming out of the captivity of fanaticism into which we were sold by those who " had zeal but not according to knowledge."

The Conservative Reformation is not to be apologized for. No good Lutheran ever will do that. It is to be lamented, how-

ever, that some of its leaders, most of whom were not really Lutherans, but outsiders, thought the Reformation didn't go far enough, and unfortunately made their influence to be felt down to the present day. They were the ones who rose up in the early stage of the Nationalistic Period and proceeded to reform what was left and kept on reforming, until everything was deformed, unformed or left without any form whatever. This especially applied to liturgical matters. Nothing that savored of "Rome" was to be tolerated. Such was not Luther's intention, nor the wish of his co-laborers. Only the abuses were to be corrected. Only those vain and fruitless ceremonies which burdened the hearts of the people, were to be abandoned. Never was it their desire to depart from the Catholic worship which was pure and historical. A few quotations taken from the "Book of Concord" will very clearly show the position and spirit of the Lutheran Reformers. From the "Apology of the Augsburg Confession," Chapter XII, Article XXIV. "Of the Mass" we read as follows:

> In the beginning we must again make the preliminary statement that we do not abolish the Mass, but religiously maintain and defend it. (p. 258.)
>
> That we abolish the daily service is most false. (p. 260.)
>
> With great zeal, we maintain the dignity of the Mass. (p. 261.)

In speaking of Church ornaments we find the following:

> It is not true that we abolish all such outward ornament. (p. 258.)
>
> Candles, golden vessels, altar cloths, images and similar ornaments are mentioned. (p. 261.)

Thus our position from that day to this. But in order to appreciate the growing tendency to return to these Catholic practices one ought to know something of the Lutheran Church's life in America. It is of course a big subject; but a brief survey of these early days will suffice.

The Lutheran Church in her early days on this continent suffered from the lack of clerical oversight, from the lack of co-operation with the mother church in Europe, from poor organization and from persecution. Naturally that early American Lutheran Church drifted from its moorings as far as practice was concerned, although, thank God, it held to its faith. It has had a checkered career in America in the matter of worship. Few books of worship and devotion were published, and those

that were published were tainted with Calvinistic ideas growing out of surrounding influences. The altars, the lights, the vestments, the essential parts of the eucharistic service disappeared in many places. Those sublime Catholic and historic heritages were almost lost to a great portion of our American Lutheran Church. And so the liturgical life of the church in America rose and fell by degrees. It became fairly well balanced again along in the early and middle "eighties," but at the close of that same period a party of Churchmen arose who proposed what was known as the "Definite Platform System," in which it was contended that there still remained "Romanistic" tendencies among us, both as to doctrine and worship. Their influence did little good for the Church. In the place of the majestic ritual were set up the human vagaries of worship such as we see around us; a sort of informal sack-coat attire which deprived the service of all meaning and beauty. Prayer meetings and revivals seemed to be the height of devotion, plus a superabundance of ecclesiastical ragtime in the place of the glorious paens of the Church. And so we drifted! But thanks be to God, a little leaven remained and that leaven is leavening the whole lump. We are coming into our own, not only in America, but in Europe as well. We are owning again the Catholic character of Divine service. The reaction has come and is spreading. Many of our Churchmen have sickened of the "husks." It is prayerfully hoped many more will come to the same state of mind. The pendulum is swinging back where it belongs.

In parishes where formerly the pulpit held the prominent position in the channel, the altar now has been restored to its proper place. Churches are everywhere being remodeled so as correctly to conform to the time-honored arrangement of the sanctuary. Eucharistic lights from two to six in number, plus additional vesper lights, are appearing on our altars. Choral communions are here and there being celebrated. Early celebrations, especially on festival days, are becoming the established practice in many parishes. Not very long ago one of our leading Church papers described a confirmation service at a certain church in New York City. The following is a paragraph from the article:

Then came the solemn communion service, in which the ancient vest-

ments were worn, even including the chasuble with the great cross of gold glowing on its red velvet background.

Such is a concrete example of this growing tendency which is truly Catholic. Chanting is finding a prominent place in the American Lutheran Church as a general practice at Matins and Vespers. In some parishes the entire communion office is intoned. Thus we are coming into our own in the restoration of the things which we have ever held dear, and of which we do not intend being deprived again by any "Zwickan Prophet" Reformers, to use a Reformation term which always denoted fanaticism. We are realizing and appreciating those treasures which rightly belong to us and which keep us in union with the great historic past, and in harmony with everything which is essentially Catholic.

There are of course "Romaniser" criers among us. The Anglican communion is not the only one so afflicted; but our Lord said, "Wisdom is justified of all her children." This may be applied here, for either they do not know history, or do not want to know it. The time is coming when they will either have to reform their views or inform their ignorance for the tendency is growing and becoming like a mighty stream, swollen with proofs for the things we do and say in behalf of the ancient, historic, and Catholic worship. The "conscientious objectors" will be "carried away as with a flood," and emptied into the gulf of hopeless defeat.

If we remain consistent and claim that we have essentially the Catholic and Apostolic Faith, it would seem to follow that we have the Catholic and Apostolic worship,—that worship which was ever the universal practice of the Church Militant.

And what a blessed satisfaction to know that in the "Divine Service" Sunday after Sunday, festival after festival, we are singing the same "Introits," praying the same "Kyrie," adoring in the same "Gloria in Excelcis," saying the same "Collect," reading the same "Epistle and Gospel," confessing the same "Creed," and thus joining with all our hearts in the worship with the whole Catholic Church throughout the world past and present and thereby striving that eventually there will be but "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism."

God bless the growing tendency toward such an end among us!

Nocturne

Rev. Marshall M. Day.

NIGHT, with its cool and quiet peace, has wrapped the camp in slumber. There is no moon, and only here and there through the rifts in the great sailing clouds the stars gleam and flash against a background of deep blue velvet. The air is full of the sounds of earth's silent places, an insect orchestra performing its endless fugue among the bushes on the dune-side, the gentle tinkling music of the lake along the shingle. The dying embers of the friendship-fire in front of the company-street make the white tents glow rosy in the darkness, and through the open doors of the nearest light up the rows of sleeping boys.

Off behind the kitchen another fire burns brighter. Its flames, fed with fresh wood, leap and flicker in a merry dance. The camp is not all asleep, for here on an empty packing-case sits the Padre, a stole hanging somewhat incongruously over the breast of his hickory shirt, his face, grave and quiet, turned a little away from the dancing firelight as his ears strain to catch the broken murmurs of the kneeling figure beside him. The clouds sweep over in silent majesty, the wind that bears them on hardly felt by lake or trees. Everywhere in the world peace reigns, save in this stormy young soul baring all its struggles and failures before its Maker, helped on by the presence and supported by the love of the only human heart that will not be turned away or alienated by what it overhears.

He had breezed into camp a day or two ago, a merry sophomore, his curly head stooping against the tump-line that bore, along with his personal outfit, a great load of goodies for the boys. Shouts of delight had hailed his approach for about a quarter of a mile down the beach. And, ever since, he had been the life of the camp. Nobody's flapjacks soared so high above the skillet, or fell back into it with such an appetizing "plop" as did Tom's. And as for eating, when at last all crisp and brown they were tossed into your impatient tin plate—"Oh boy!" Nobody was quite like Tom when it came to taking the water-funks down to the icy lake, and after a half hour or so of sympathetic raillery and vehement exhortation leaving

them masters of the art of swimming. Nobody else had such a store of woodcraft wisdom, or knew so many fine out-of-doors games that could be played without the help of curbs or flagstones. None of these town-bred boys could keep him out when, after dark, he would swing off through the woods, and in spite of eager cordons of vigilant sentries creep up to the fire and steal the great camp-kettle that was the symbol of victory. Decidedly we had never had a trip like this one, and decidedly it was all due to Tom.

Yet all this gaiety had seemed to the Padre's experienced eye a little overdone. His ear had caught the slightly excessive note in the gay laugh. And this morning the dish-wash ceremony had afforded a few precious moments for private conversation; not much, but enough for the purpose:

"What's on your mind, old man? Better get it off now, when the wild Indians are temporarily occupied."

"Padre, I came down to Winsor to make my confession. When I found you had left for the choir-camp I was awfully disappointed. But, somehow, I felt I must see you anyway, so I got an outfit and came down here. I don't see though, in all this rough-house, how you can get any chance to 'tend to me."

"Doesn't seem much chance for quiet or privacy, for a fact. I tell you what—the camp goes to bed at nine and is usually quiet by about half-past. Think things over today, whenever you get the chance, and come to me in the kitchen tonight after the boys are asleep."

And so the kitchen—a somewhat misleading name, for it is only a rough shelter of boughs, put up to protect the cooks' backs from the sun as they stoop to the open fire—becomes a Church, where, while the camp slumbers, the Padre and Tom bend themselves to the task of binding up the wounds received in the Lord's warfare.

With the tale that Tom is pouring forth, there by the fireside, you and I have no concern. This is an intimacy so awful that upon it not even the courts of law presume to intrude. Only of this be assured, the sins are real sins, the struggle is a real warfare, and the wounds are deep gashes, needing wise and sound treatment or they will leave great, ugly scars upon the soul that should be so gloriously beautiful in the sight of

God and His Holy Ones. It is easy for editors of Broad Church magazines, men who have never in their lives been present at a confession, either as penitent or as confessor, to talk about "mechanical murmuring of peccadilloes into priestly ears." But if we look at it from the point of view of the penitent there are no peccadilloes. Has any priest ever heard a confession that did not contain sins sufficient in number and gravity, if one has due regard for the penitent's stage of spiritual growth, to justify to the full the Sacrament of Penance? A sin that is capable of causing anxiety to a human soul is a legitimate subject for this kind of treatment, even though it be such as might seem trifling to your conscience or mine. One of the most humbling and salutary experiences of a priest's life is to find a penitent bewailing, with real anguish of spirit, acts and words which he himself will use with hardly a passing thought.

Moreover, it is absurd to say that "sometimes those who practice it (Confession) are by no means the sturdiest type of Christians." It is equally true that one often finds in doctors' offices those who are by no means the sturdiest type of physical manhood. This is admittedly a Sacrament for those who find that their own strength has failed them. And how often those same sturdy Christians are really those who stand in direst need of penitential discipline. It is so easy to mistake a callous conscience for a sturdy one. The Anglican Communion as a whole is much more in danger of contentment with a low degree of spiritual attainment, than of over-conscientiousness about little things. There is such a sin as other-worldliness. Our tendency is rather to be merely worldly, masking it under the pleasing title of healthy-mindedness.

But Tom has ceased to speak, his curly head sinks again into his hands, and in the silence that follows the Padre stirs himself slightly and turns just a bit toward the kneeling figure at his side. The wounds have all been exposed, now is the time to heal them by the age-old Scriptural process of pouring in oil and wine. But for a moment the Padre does not speak, pausing to realize to the full that awful Presence in whose Name and by whose authority he is about to act.

First must come the wine of spiritual counsel, its stinging bite burning up those little germs of excuse or self-justification

that would cause the wounds to fester and break forth anew. The priest does well to hesitate before taking upon him the terrible responsibility of Director of the Conscience, and wise and merciful is the Church in permitting him, especially if young and inexperienced, to refuse even at this solemn hour to assume it. Now he begins to speak. His voice, low and unhurried, is studiously expressionless, to avoid all appearance of shocked self-righteousness or of an over-indulgent palliation of what, however natural to most of mankind, however familiar it may have grown through his own soul's struggles or those of the many he has helped, is none the less an outrage on the merciful love of God. First the sins are presented to the penitent in their true light, and their real source and effect are clearly shown. Next follow suggestions of the best way of meeting or avoiding temptation, and warnings when to fight and when to retire at discretion from the neighborhood of too great danger. Then the priest prescribes such methods or acts of self-discipline as will be really corrective, and strengthen the soul in its new-born resolution to do the right. The short, crisp "Will you do this?" and the whispered, but firm-purposed "Yes, Father," bring this stage of the confession to a close, and all is now ready for the joyous consummation.

The wounds have all been exposed and cleansed by frank confession. They have been stimulated to heal by the stinging wine of counsel. Now they are ready for the mollifying oil of God's free, loving pardon. The Padre's hand moves to form the sign of man's Redemption, his quiet voice takes on a new ring of authority and sure conviction: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who has left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences; And by His authority unto me committed, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The curly head lifts up, the vigorous young shoulders straighten, and under the peaceful stars, in the quiet hush of the Summer night, the Padre speaks the final benediction: "Go in peace, for the Lord hath taken away thy sin."

Four Uses of God by Men of the Bible

4. The Use of God as the Giver of Work

Rev. Fleming James, Ph.D.

WE have gone far enough in our examinations of the use of God by men to perceive there are various ways in which they may use Him, all valuable, but not all of equal value. He was to the First Psalmist the Giver of Health, Happiness and Success. To others like the Twenty-second and the Fifty-first Psalmists He seemed to fail in this, and in their ensuing despair they threw themselves upon Him to find in Him a Personal Deliverer. Passing through the door of salvation they would naturally seek of Him light on the new way opened before them and come to prize Him as the Teacher who became more and more the Friend. At any rate by whatever door they arrived, we meet Psalmists like the Nineteenth and Seventy-third whose main thought is to enjoy the instruction and companionship of God. This month we are to consider what is perhaps the highest value God can possess in a life—His value when men use Him as the Giver of the Work.

Here I propose to leave behind the Psalmists who have hitherto taught us much in this matter of the use of God, and to go forth into the Bible boldly, scrutinizing the great men who stand forth in its record as the chief benefactors and the sublimest prophets of the race. It supplies us with a remarkable number of intimate personal narratives coming from these men themselves, telling how they became aware of what God was to mean in their future, and in every case God appears as the Giver of the Work.

We can consider two. Thus it was with Moses. In that classic third chapter of Exodus is handed down the tradition of how God met him and abruptly changed the whole course of his life. He was keeping the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law, and he led the flock to the back of the wilderness, and came to the mountain of God, unto Horeb. If you had seen him you would not have distinguished him from any other of the Oriental shepherds who had in generations past brought their sheep to the barren slopes of this ancient mountain. But he was think-

ing different thoughts from theirs. Upon his heart lay ever the burden of what was going on far to the northward among his own people in Egypt. Ah, the bitterness of their fate! Well could he remember the cruel oppressions and insults he was compelled to witness without the power to help, until the fatal day when he had killed an Egyptian and been compelled to flee.

Since then he had married and settled down to peaceful desert ways but he could not banish the sound of their groaning from his ears. From that his mind turned upward to God. Surely God was hearing it also. Surely He would not remain idle, but would remember his covenant with their father and intervene! It was in the midst of such broodings (we may well believe) that he drew near the mountain which had from of old been associated with the name of Deity. Suddenly his eyes rested upon a thorny shrub out of which fire flamed. A moment's examination showed him that this was no common fire: the bush was not consumed. And he said, "I will turn aside now and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt." But lo, as he turned a voice uttering his own name "Moses, Moses." Prompt the answer, "Here am I." And He said, "Draw not nigh hither, but put off thy shoes from off thy feet for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." And then, "I am the God of thy father Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob." And Moses hid his face for he was afraid to look upon God. Thus God came to him for the first time, as he was to meet him continually hereafter, face to face. God had called him by his name. And now what was God to be to Moses? Was He to supply this man's bodily needs, to minister to his success, to save him from despair, to be his Teacher and Friend? Yes, God would be all this to Moses; but it was not with such personal ends that He was concerned. Rather His care was for Israel, for the nation.

And the Lord said, "I have surely seen the affliction of my people that are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows; and I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them out of that land into a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey. . . . Come now therefore and I will send thee unto Pharaoh that thou mayest bring

forth my people out of Egypt!" Then as Moses shrank back with excuses, God said, "Certainly I will be with thee." There was no answer to that. What was an impossible thing for Moses was a light thing to God, and God would be with his servant. Surely! For He who gives the work gives also the power to accomplish it. God is always at hand. He says "Go do this", but He does not send us away: He goes with us. Therefore Moses would learn in the labor and anguish of leadership to use God as the Supplier and Savior and Teacher and Friend—yet not for himself but for Israel. That solitary great man would carry his nation upon his shoulders as a father carries his child; and he himself would be carried also; underneath him and these would be the " everlasting arms".

I wish I might dwell upon what God meant to this pure strong soul. No more selfless benefactor of mankind can be found than he who lives in the pages of Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. These stories of Moses' experience were indeed committed to writing long after he was gone, but in the main they must be correct. Surely from his own lips came the revelation of what passed between him and God in secret places.

When did he ever take thought for private gain? More than once the temptation assailed him to give up his bitter struggles and leave Israel to their fate. God—so it seemed to him—suggested that he do it, promising to make of Moses a nation mightier and greater than they! But no, Moses would not listen to such thoughts. This—even Israel—was God's people: this nation God must save.

Therefore to Moses was given what he did not ask: he who was intent on using God for others obtained God as his own possession. To after ages he was pre-eminently the friend of God. " There hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face."

Let us now leap over half a millenium and come upon another servant of the LORD. In the year 740 B. C. a young man was brooding—much as Moses had brooded long before—upon the condition of Israel. No foreign oppressor now held the nation in exile and bondage: alas, the trouble lay within. Everywhere his keen young eyes rested, Isaiah saw but filth and rottenness. Selfish luxury, injustice, oppression of the poor, drunkenness,

darkness of heart, the forms of religion observed but God unknown and unheeded, priest and prophet plying their sacred office for gain, rich and poor alike given to false worship—all this and much more made the people ripe for judgment. God must do something or it would be too late. Perhaps even now the hour of doom had struck! King Uzziah, whose strong arm had held his subjects up to a certain standard, was dead. What was the future to be? Tortured by such anxieties Isaiah on a certain day bent his steps to the House of God; and then quite unexpectedly he met God and received his call. Very simply he tells of it.

"In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above him stood the seraphim: each one had six wings: with twain he covered his face; and with twain he covered his feet and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another and said, "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. And the foundations of the threshold shook at the voice of him that cried and the house was filled with smoke." Yes, there was God! In unutterable majesty the Lord of heaven and earth was revealed before his mortal gaze. But what amid the song of flaming cherubim and the rocking of the thresholds and the thickening smoke—what thought first crashes into this man's mind? What does God—there—mean to him?

"Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts."

He is like the Fifty-first Psalmist except that for him the stain of corporate sin is added to personal defilement. Indeed it must be chiefly the crimes of the community that weigh upon him, seeing that he himself is probably clear of great transgression. But at any rate, both individually and as part of Israel, he needs God's cleansing before he can endure the ineffable presence, and such a need God can supply. "Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hands, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar: and he touched my mouth with it, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips: and thine iniquity is taken away and thy sin forgiven." Thus God

saved him; and only after that did he hear the voice, not of the seraphim but of the Lord Himself saying, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" There it is again—the work to be done, the demand for the worker. Then I said, "Here am I, send me." And He said, "Go and tell this people. Hear ye indeed but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn again and be healed."

Was ever a commission so sad in its irony? The work will fail, nevertheless it must be done, and Isaiah must do it. Human resolution might well cry out at the task! "Then said I, Lord, how long? And he said, Until cities be waste without inhabitant, and houses without man, and the land become utterly waste, and the LORD has removed men far away, and the forsaken places be many in the midst of the land. And if there be a tenth in it, it shall also in turn be eaten up: as a terebinth, and as an oak, whose stock remaineth when they are felled. (Now at last gleams a ray of far off hope): So the holy seed is the stock thereof."

Thus the young man went down from the temple that day from the presence of God to spend his life in fruitless effort to recall Israel to their Lord, knowing that Israel would not hear, but knowing also that some few would, and that there would be the holy seed of a better nation, that these after the cutting down of the stately tree would put forth as from a living root and live again. Henceforth God would be always to him the Giver of just this Work, having purged him thereto by the coal from the altar. Little leisure would he possess to use God for his own Health, Happiness and Success. Sufficient that enough strength was supplied him for his superhuman task. This indeed he would receive and much more. He would, like Moses, be deeply taught of God, would come to know God very intimately, but all the while his thoughts would be for Israel. On them would he spend freely whatsoever he received from on high, forgetful of his own enjoyment: and therefore he would receive ever the more for self. Such is the double blessing of those who use God as the Giver of Work.

These two examples of our final use of God must suffice,

though we might add many more from the Bible and from the annals of Christian biography. Indeed I venture to say that we cannot find any really great life in any age which has not used God, if it has used Him at all, as the Giver of Work. Whether it be a Socrates or a Paul or a Lincoln it is all one in this—God was to them not a Being to be availed of for mere individual good—but One who was ever bidding them arise and serve. But let us not stop with the conspicuous figures of history, as if they were called out from the herd to an exceptional relation with God. Not so! For what was true of them ought to be true of all those obscure children of the Father whose name will never be written in earth's halls of fame.

The departing householder, said Jesus in his parable, left his house and gave authority to his servants, to each his work. And so the Holy Spirit, when He descended upon the early disciples, imparted to each his particular gift implying his particular function and service. No one however humble was left unendowed. And so God, when He came in His Spirit, came always as the Giver of Work, not alone to Paul and Peter, but to Tryphaena and Tryphosa and Persis and those other plain people, slaves probably, whom the great apostle in the sixteenth chapter of Romans greets as his fellow-laborers in the Lord. That is why the infant Church grew and blessed mankind.

If the Church of today is in like manner to grow and bless the sorrowing world, we too—each in his own way—must come to know God as the Giver of Work.

Do we know Him thus? If we do not, or if our knowledge of Him in this respect is faint, then there is no necessity for such a state to continue. Learn of Moses and Isaiah. In the case of both we noticed that before God's call came to them their minds must have been occupied with the thought of human need. That was because they were informed as to conditions (to employ a modern phrase). Moses had witnessed Israel's oppression; Isaiah, Israel's glaring social injustices. They knew what was taking place in the world of their fellows. Now, if we desire to have God give us a work we ought first of all to inform ourselves as to "how the other half lives." The moment we begin to study what goes on in our tenement districts, our mills, our prisons; how the immigrant fares; how the Near East Chris-

tians perish on our shores; how the negro is treated; how Europe suffers and Russia goes hungry, what life is in the Orient—and a thousand other matters that lie close at hand in the pages and reports of unimpeachable documents—that same moment we shall learn of things which make the heart ache and the soul burn with the conviction that something must be done.

Therefore the Nation-Wide Campaign is right in sounding the note of study and investigation. Find out the facts, it says, feeling sure that the facts will prepare God's way in each for His call to work.

Learn the facts first. Then try to see self as part of the whole. Let our Health, Happiness and Success merge themselves in concern for the common weal. Surely that is God's will. He cares for us—yes infinitely—and yet He cares just as infinitely for all the rest. How can we be selfish or self-centered in our use of Him? The Ninety-first Psalmist was able to use Him thus. He could picture himself as shielded by God's special providence in the midst of universal calamity. He says to his soul, "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night, nor for the arrow that flieth by day: for the pestilence that walketh in darkness nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday. A thousand shall fall by thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked." There he stands quite reconciled to the situation, in fact taking a great deal of satisfaction in it. After all these people who are being ruined are the wicked: it serves them right!

But I venture to say that most of us could not feel that. There may not be much of Moses and Isaiah in our composition but we should have to distress ourselves over that thousand and that ten thousand. Poor people! And the thought would come to us, "Have I the right to my prosperity in the face of such a mass of adversity—yes, even though I may have deserved it?"

No, we could not be so indifferent and complacent. But our trouble is because this thousand and ten thousand do not fall at our right hand but far away out of sight, that we do not know, do not realize, do not suffer, do not look to God to do something, do not hear Him call to do that something ourselves. That, it seems to me, is the explanation of America's aloofness today.

To conclude—If we get the facts and suffer over them and look up to God to do something about them, then we are in the way to meet Him and to hear Him call us by name as He called Moses, saying, "Come now therefore and I will send thee." Thus shall we begin to use Him as the Giver of the Work.

And that is the great use of God! Know him indeed as the Supplier of your diurnal needs; know Him as Saviour, as Teacher, as Friend. But behold a more excellent way! Know Him as the Giver of Work, and all these things will be added unto you.

"Other Sheep Not of This Fold"

NO. IV.

THE QUAKERS.

Rev. Hamilton Schuyler

THE QUAKERS, or as they prefer to be called, "The Society of Friends", had their rise in England in the middle of the seventeenth century. Quakerism emerged out of the religious chaos then prevailing and found its beginnings in the preaching and example of George Fox. Fox emphasized the need of a more spiritual religion than that commonly professed about him and succeeded in persuading many others to adopt his peculiar views. He advocated a form of Christianity which discarded as unspiritual a definite creed, an ordained ministry and objective means of grace such as the sacraments; and insisted upon the sufficiency of the "inner light" vouchsafed to every man. Fox was a man of scant education and humble parentage and exhibited in his manner and speech many of the characteristics of a religious fanatic. His radical views on religion and his total disregard for the social amenities of his time and the ecclesiastical and political principles that were commonly accepted brought the movement into conflict with the authorities in Church and State and led to the enforcement of penal laws and regulations against those who adopted Quaker teaching and practice.

Not only the Established Church but all forms of Protestant dissent as well placed Quakerism under a ban and rigorously persecuted its votaries. The movement in its earlier days was regarded very much as Bolshevism is at the present time. Quakers refused to take the customary oath in the law courts, declined to uncover the head in the presence of judges and other civil functionaries, passively resisted military duty and the paying of taxes. Besides these things they often outraged public opinion by vituperative speech and a disregard for the ordinary conventions of English life. Under the circumstances the persecution of the early Quakers is not to be wondered at and had at least the justification that those who adopted its tenets were ostensibly engaged in an effort to break down respect for the

civil law and render it a nullity, at least in their own case. It is not, however, with this phase of the movement that we are at present concerned, but rather with Quakerism on its religious side. It is possible here only to give a brief resumé of its history and doctrines as a religious society and to draw such conclusions as may seem profitable to ourselves.

The first Quakers, like other Protestants of the time, accepted the Bible as their rule of faith; but of course interpreted the same in accordance with their peculiar views. They were orthodox as to their belief in the central verities of the Christian religion, paying special heed to the personality and work of the Holy Spirit. The doctrine of a visible Church, however, and all that flows from it were rejected. The sacraments were regarded as mere symbols or figures the material elements of which were negligible, though the virtue of the sacraments was supposed to be inwardly appropriated by the spiritually-minded. Baptism was not by water but solely of the Spirit, and the Holy Communion was an inward process of mystical feeding and drinking with no use of the outward substances of bread and wine. Of worship strictly speaking there was none, but meetings were held during which if any felt moved to audible prayer or exhortation their words were regarded as utterances of the Spirit. There was no ordained or paid ministry and only a modicum of machinery for mutual help and the enforcement of necessary discipline. Women were accorded an equal place with men in the councils of the Society and the children of Quaker parents were members of the Society by birthright. Little or no effort was made to gain converts and numerically the Society has never been powerful, though its indirect influence has been considerable in communities where it has flourished.

Modern Quakerism has preserved the main features that characterized its beginnings though many of its peculiar customs and ways have been greatly modified. There have been several splits from the main stem but the Orthodox Quakers so-called still constitute the vast majority. The crudeness in speech and vulgarity in manners which marked the original Quakers and rendered them so obnoxious to their conservative neighbours has wholly disappeared and today there is little outwardly to distinguish them from other people. The acquirement

of money,—for they are extremely shrewd and clannish in business,—and the emphasis laid upon education have tended to assimilate their habits with the habits of those around them, while the strict integrity of their lives and their generosity to all worthy causes have won them the respect and admiration of their fellows. Many of their representatives have distinguished themselves in various walks of life and some among them, such as John Bright in England, have achieved eminence in political careers.

Quakerism has a pathetic interest for the student of religious movements in that it is fast disappearing as an institution from the religious life of the day. The latest statistics give the Quakers a total membership in the United States of less than one hundred and twenty thousand. But if Quakerism is doomed to die out as an organized religious force in the world, it will yet leave behind it the memory of certain distinct achievements and will be rightfully credited with having exercised a beneficent effect upon the ethical ideals of the communities it has touched.

Certainly one of its most notable results was to bring into clearer light a truth which has been too often forgotten or minimized by Christian people, namely, the direct and immediate action of God's Holy Spirit upon and within the soul of the individual. This is a doctrine which the Catholic Church has always held, however much it may have been glossed over or ignored by many Catholic teachers. It is stated for us in those words of the creed, " I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life."

Much of the theology of Fox's day was often a mere logic-chopping about the profoundest subjects. The fierce disputes about Calvinism and Arminianism; the rabid denunciation which Puritans directed against liturgies and vestments; the subtle, fine-spun, hair-splitting distinctions of a meticulous Roman theology,—both as to minor doctrines and questions of common morality; the Anglican determination to exact conformity in the smallest matters—were all things which rendered the time ripe for a movement which would denounce all such matters as so much ecclesiastical rubbish and, taking its stand outside of the contending parties, seek only to inquire what God actually required of man.

It was given to George Fox, an English Churchman, to attempt to answer the question " What is the essence of true religion?" If the answer he gave ignored many things which we esteem necessary and precious, the fault was not wholly his, but must be shared with those whose bounden duty it was to give him instruction in the doctrines of a true Christianity.

It was not Fox's original intention to found a new sect. His only desire, or perhaps his first desire, was to form a society of friends, whose influence should regenerate the mass of the people and bring them back to a recognition of old truths. But it was not long before this society, as it gained adherents, and particularly as it fell under the influence and direction of educated men like Barclay and Penn, became a distinct body having its own doctrines, discipline and forms of worship.

The reason why Fox and his followers separated themselves from the Church, and also from the dissenting bodies as well, was their belief that all outward forms and ordinances were merely the shell of true religion and were, therefore, not necessary to the spiritually-minded.

If George Fox had been taught the doctrines of the Catholic Church in all their fullness and beauty, it is safe to say that he would never have separated himself from it. No one seems to have taken the trouble to assure this enthusiastic, pious and upon the whole spiritually-minded young man that what he longed for and advocated was to be found in the Church of his baptism.

Churchmen today may learn a valuable lesson from the Quaker protest against unreality in religion. With the Quakers we believe in the truth of the " inner light "; we believe in the supremacy of conscience. We believe that the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, is ever holding communion with men and witnessing in their hearts to truth and purity and righteousness. But while we believe this, it is certain that we do not always sufficiently emphasize it. It is not improbable that many really spiritually-minded people are estranged from institutional Christianity because of our slackness and hesitancy in proclaiming this great truth. A sincerely religious man looks within himself and recognizes there the presence of a holy influence, guiding, warning, encouraging. He is as certain of this fact as of anything in his

life. It is a daily experience of his existence. He feels, and rightly feels, that to ignore or to be untrue to this divine light would be to reject and become unfaithful to the best he knows.

Such a one often finds that this spiritual experience which is so tremendously real to him is slightly regarded by other professedly religious people, or, perhaps, credited to an over-imaginative and enthusiastic temperament on his own part. Forms, ceremonies, secraments, ordinances, ritual practices, seem to such a person vain and lifeless things compared to the indubitable reality of an ever-present spiritual mentor dwelling in his own breast. He prefers to seek God and commune with Him in the innermost shrine of his own being to worshipping Him in a conventional manner and according to prescribed forms. In what Quakerism affirmed it was mainly true and was in perfect accord with the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Where it made its great mistake was in supposing that the "inner light", as experienced by the individual, was an infallible witness to truth and did not need to be corrected, assisted and guided by the religious consciousness of the Church.

The early Quakers were active exponents of philanthropy in an age in which the inherent rights of the individual were generally disregarded. They were the first to propose a settlement of disputes by arbitration and they consistently refused to go to law in their own interest. Their standard of commercial rectitude was so high that they required their members to pay all their just debts even when legally released from the obligations to do so.

The Quakers were the first Christian body to purge themselves from the stain of dealing in slaves. As early as 1780 not a slave was owned by any Quaker in England or America. The first petition to abolish the slave-trade was presented to parliament by the Quakers in 1783, and in the long agitation which followed the Quakers took an active and prominent part. The Quakers have always occupied a foremost place in the cause of popular education and became the founders of schools and colleges giving an excellent education at a reasonable cost. In the amelioration of the condition of criminals and in a gentler and more humane treatment of lunatics, the Quakers did notable service. It must also be said to the credit of the Quakers that

they rarely attempted to make converts to their principles under the cover of their philanthropic labors. Their charity and benevolence have never been of the narrow kind, but have expended themselves on the lines of a broad philanthropy. They have exemplified the charity that seeketh not her own. We may cordially give them the appellation they have chosen for themselves—"Friends".

Their doctrine of non-resistance has at times been subjected to severe strains as in the recent war, but on the whole has been faithfully persisted in and has brought its due reward. The persecution they endured in early times at the hands of all parties redounded wholly to their own credit. It is not too much to say that the Quaker leaven of practical benevolence towards all men without respect to race or creed has impregnated the mass and has been one of the moving examples making for a gentler and more humane attitude towards the unfortunate and oppressed. Probably it is not overstating the matter to affirm that practical Christianity, the Christianity of the Sermon on the Mount, is under a vast debt to the Quakers for their constant endeavors to give expression to it in their own lives.

The most interesting development of Quakerism has been in this country. It is here under the conditions of a free and untrammeled civil and religious life that the Quakers have been able to exhibit the best that was in their system. It is true that in the earliest days they were bitterly persecuted, especially in the colony of Massachusetts, where laws proscribing them were severely enforced, but such measures merely operated to lead them to establish themselves in more hospitable quarters. Residence being denied them elsewhere, they came to New Jersey in large numbers, and under William Penn founded the commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In sections where they predominated perfect liberty of conscience has always obtained. Penn's treatment of the Indians was in marked contrast to that which usually prevailed. He recognized the Indians as the rightful possessors of the land, and dealt with them in a spirit of fraternity and generosity. During the time that the Quaker influence was dominant and for seventy years after the foundation of Pennsylvania, the Indians are said never to have taken the life of a white man, and once, when five hundred Indians were assembled

to plan a massacre, they were turned from their purpose by six unarmed Friends.

It is a significant fact that there is today in the American Church a large contingent of those whose ancestors professed the Quaker doctrine. When Quakers leave their own body they seem to choose the Episcopal Church by a sort of natural affinity. Probably it is the reaction from a system which repudiates all sacraments and liturgical forms, that leads them to unite themselves with a Church which regards the sacraments as essential and whose services are conducted with a quiet dignity and according to a prescribed order.

Loose-Leaf Memoirs of a Parson's Daughter

By Filia

LET me be Hibernian enough to begin my own reminiscences with those of my father. For, being a "Church-baby" and a parson's child, that dearly-prized heredity is really the cause of jotting down these "Memories."

In my earliest recollections then, my father piqued the interest of his "olive-branches" by telling us of the great Dr. Breck, who carried the star of missionary empire westward to that "Lodge in a vast wilderness" which became Nashotah. With avid interest we listened to the account of that small group of young men from Trinity, Southwark and Philadelphia who found their call in that planting within the virgin forest which encircled the "Twin Lakes." What "moving adventures by flood and field" took place in those railroad-less days! It was even a part of the story that several years later my parents were snow-bound on their very honeymoon in reaching Green Bay!

We learned that the early life of Nashotah House was almost a monastic one; that the city-bred young men laundered and mended for themselves as well as said the Offices for the Hours. We heard of Dr. Adams, learned and sound in theology and as witty as an Irishman has a right to be, who was professor of dogmatics—which didn't mean canines! We knew the sainted James DeKoven; and we venerated the fatherly Bishop Kemper who extended his personal interest in his students onward to their missionary fields, their households and their belongings—even to "The Episcopal Rat" as was dubbed the Bucephalus my father drove.

Preaching to the Indians on the Oneida Reservation; crossing Lake Winnebago, or the Fox River, on the ice in the midst of the spring flux; taking long night journeys through the forest, when only the "Rat" could find the road; ministering to distant lumbermen and their families at the time of deaths or marriages; making the acquaintance of the Rev. Eleazar Williams, the reputed Dauphin—these, too, were some of the household

yarns to which we children listened with stretched ears—and perhaps mouths. According to one such anecdote (as we delighted to learn), where a wedding had been the (far) moving cause of a long trip, my mother had been presented, as a souvenir, with a huge plain gold ring which she felt certain had formerly bound the buxom middle-aged bride to her first husband.

So far, these recollections are somewhat jumbled in my memory. I must get on to those personal ones which belong to my more advanced life of six to twelve years and thereabouts. These occurred in " fresh fields and pastures new " which, by paradox, was a city environment. One of the earliest is of resenting that my father should be called a " Puseyite ", a term quite as terrible to my ears as Nihilist or the later Ku-Klux would have been. I remember that, after suitable explanation, I regarded with deeper respect the familiar back of a volume of Dr. Pusey's sermons, which stood on the " Study " shelves. These reverential glances, I may add, led to no further acquaintance within the covers; nothing so closely printed, nor in such unattractive binding, being then seductive to my reading appetite.

The " Oxford Movement ", I suppose, early broke upon my horizon. A book turned up in which previous, contrasting conditions were set forth by text and illustrations. One of the full-page plates set forth a Georgian church interior with a bare and neglected sanctuary and a "Communion-table " piled with the hats and other impediments of parson, curate and clerk. Over this, I gloated with proper horror. The " three-deckers " of other plates were not so novel—at least by hearsay. I had already relished the recital of an incident of post-Revolutionary days in our own Mohawk Valley, where a loyal Church-of-England clergyman had preached determinedly from the upper story of such a pulpit, while the encroaching Presbyterian parson as doggedly held forth below.

In these days (the late sixties), the black gown and white " bands " were still the preaching vestment. I have always felt that in them the parson—as preacher—really looked the part. And what a fascinating possibility to the childish mind was that of those " bands " becoming askew! How entertaining it would

have been if such a pair of white wings had fluttered off into space, as the elm seeds do! But this diversion was denied.

A flourishing parish-school belonged to this period. How I envied the children who attended, while " Melancholy Me " was taught at home by our devoted parents! When, at some simple exhibition, the pupils donned blue card-board shields over their more distinctive garments, forming a banner with the strange device, " St. Luke's Parish School ", the admiration, if not the envy of the parson's daughter was complete.

Of course religious instruction took prime place. Morning and Evening Prayer were said in the adjoining church at the opening and the close of the day. The weekly Eucharist was then established in the parish—perhaps even earlier. This was offered at the 10:30 service; but it will be remembered that this was over fifty years ago, and the weekly celebration still a novelty savoring dangerous of " Puseyism ".

I believe that there were always flowers on our altar—but no candles. My father would have liked them, and incense; and so would Bishop Coxe—theoretically. The latter's " Christian Ballads " we children declaimed with great gusto. Our favorite was:

" 'Twas a true-hearted Scotsman
Had risen from his knees,
All in a glorious chapel
Reared by the old Culdees.
That day, the axe of Orange
On Scotland's altars rung,
And down fair cross and crozier
Upon the earth were flung! "

The Culdees and the crozier may have puzzled me; but there was no doubt about the histrionic swing of the ballad.

I am convinced that there was an altar-cross upon our church altar, though I confess that I do not distinctly remember it. Thereby hangs a tale of later incident in another locality. The hero—or villain—of this story was a North-of-Ireland sexton and vestryman who repeatedly removed a simple altar-cross, which had been rescued from the oblivion of a sacristy closet. Just how long before the Spirit of Counsel persuaded this good man that the Sign of his redemption did not imply Popish idol worship, I am unable to say. I only know that Mr. S. became a loyal Churchman and a family friend. I know, too, that some

of us children heartily enjoyed our visits to the village cemetery, the care of which was another of his engaging occupations!

Full-length altar cloths of course belong to these early annals—very ugly, as I recall. The green was vivid—by no means olive. The violet was brightish purple; and I should say that the red was a crimson. Surplices, of course, were made very full and long, gathered as tightly as possible into a shallow yoke, the length and weight of the linen rendering a cassock unnecessary. When a taller man occasionally officiated in our parish, something more or less than a foot-length of clerical legs might sometimes be visible, reminding a naughty girl of two short sections of stove-pipe. (*Apropos* of this, I remember that in my boarding school days a passage-screen, unusually high from the ground, was dubbed " Canon " because of its length of uncurtained legs.)

The stole (unchanged for seasons) was always a broad black one, such as is now called a " tippet." The sermon cover of black or violet velvet was carried conspicuously into the pulpit. Yet extemporaneous sermons were sometimes delivered to a night congregation—and there was a *full* attendance at night-services fifty years ago.

If anybody within our ken wore Eucharistic vestments, I did not learn of it. A little later, my mother, during a New York visit, took me with her to St. Alban's, then reputed plague-stricken with " Romanizing germs ". Here were the vestments! I confess that I did not know what I was doing in the service until literally " brought up standing " by the Creed or the *Gloria in Excelsis.*

It is almost needless, I suppose, considering dates and data, to assert that my father always wore " clericals "—even in the garden. Certainly, I have seen his silk-hat—though not invariably—among the cabbages or the Canterbury Bells.

The table-talk of visiting bishops and clergy was an unfailing source of delight to at least one of " the younger fry ". Such interesting experiences as they talked about! And such funny stories as they told! How glad I am that I was not kept from listening to such men as Bishop Seymour, Bishop W. C. Doane, Dr. Gibson of Utica and the Church Eclectic, Dr. Mulcahy of

New York, Dr. Goodwin of Newark, and Dr. Battershall of Albany!

Occasionally, a clerical visitor was less welcome. I remember one who raised his morning egg-cup to his nose, asking, " Are these eggs fresh? " It happened that our mother might have answered that our hens usually laid them that way.

Church unity was a topic much less discussed at the time of which I am writing than now. It then seemed such an impossible consummation however devoutly to be wished. " High " and " Low " were terms more frequently bandied than in our day. (I had an idea that " Low " was very low-down indeed!). " Broad " and " Advanced " had not come into general use although one was sometimes puzzled by the overwhelming term, " Latitudinarian ".

The Church in my youth had by no means grown into her present attitude—if we can use such a definite term—on the divorce question. The marriage of the innocent party was often too readily performed with little investigation. There was no legal questionnaire—at least in New York State, in those days. My father had his own method of cross-questioning; but I remember one instance in which he was deplorably deceived. No sooner was the rite performed than the contracting parties openly boasted that they had " fooled the minister ". Whether they considered that they had also outwitted the Almighty did not appear.

Rectory weddings were frequent, of course. These were often " nuts " to the naughty. I recall one exuberant bridegroom bestowing upon my youthful self a small fee in addition to the larger one already given. I was too surprised—or possibly too covetous—to protest. One bride-to-be, planning a church wedding-function, balked at the word " obey ". She was warned that the wedding would be halted unless she said it. In a few weeks the matter came to the test. Bride and groom and friends were before the altar. " Love, honor and obey " the officiant pronounced clearly. " Love, honor," the bride faltered—and stopped. A second time, the words of the pledge rang out in firmer tones. An eternal pause. Then as the priest was turning away, the bride gasped out, " and obey ".

" Mixed " funerals and private christenings were refused in

our parish, the parson having not yet arrived at the happy liberality of a small member of my infant class, many years later. This innocent announced with startling effect, " I loves *everybody*—I does—even the Old Devil himself a little bit sometimes! "

In the confirmation class of which I was a member, I recall that there was much said about the historical position of the Church, and much doctrinal teaching concerning the sacraments. I am afraid it may have been in some cases over the heads of the hearers. My Sunday school instructor—A Maine Churchman—certainly drilled us well on the Catechism. For years, I used to repeat it (silently!) while occupying the dentist's chair.

Sunday-school libraries were then a large factor in one's Church training. " The Little Episcopalian," Mrs. Brock's series on the Prayer Book, Miss Sewell's stories and those of A. L. O. E., and of course the tales of Miss Yonge, were read and enjoyed in my school-days even by children who loved " The Scottish Chiefs ", the " Days of Bruce ", and " The Moonstone ".

I must emphasize particularly my own debt to Miss Yonge. Certainly her tales stirred my spiritual depths as no other fiction has ever done. Recently, I tested myself as to whether I could recall (after a lapse of many years), the thirteen children of the family in " The Pillars of the House ". Readily I remembered twelve, *with their characteristics.* Research developed that the thirteenth was an " innocent ", who had none!

The clergy made many pastoral calls, thirty, forty, fifty years ago. My father has made over a thousand in a year in his largest city parish. At this time he was writing, on an average, more than one sermon a week, officiating at daily services and tutoring his own children in all subjcets, including the classics. Of course there were not so many parish, diocesan and nation-wide organizations to be run. Our people, however, were often gathered for social purposes. The tying of Christmas greens in those days was almost a parish function. The rector I know best would have liked to turn the church almost into a Forest of Lebanon, and was much given to Old English lettering, designed and cut by himself.

How it was all done on twenty-four hours a day, with no

automobiles nor telephones to help out, I cannot explain. I only know that then all the cranks and bores—and there were some even in the " good old days "—visited the parson personally. One of these, I recall, fancied that she was being persecuted by Jesuits, from which the rector could deliver her—And there was none to deliver him!

As to a vacation, I never knew my parson to take more than two real ones. There were some enforced rests ordered by authority. It is no wonder that this need recurred more frequently toward the close of his forty years in the priesthood.

In some points, of course, we were all less " advanced " than now. Auricular confession, for instance, in my early experience, was taboo as regards public mention. I remember my father saying that the selection of a director should be made with the utmost care. Religious orders in our own Communion were unknown to me until my boarding-school days, when I came under the partial care of Sisters. A few years later, Father Huntington, in the prime of his young manhood, preached in a neighboring parish. About the same time, parochial missions reached to my environment. Of course I knew nothing for many years of retreats or reservation.

In spite of such serious lacks, I may conclude by asserting that I am most thankful for my Church training of fifty years since—far more so even than for my endless drill in Andrew's and Stoddard's Latin Grammar, Harkness' First Greek Book, Peter Parley's histories and the gems of the National Fifth Reader!

A Confessor on the Mystical Life*

Translated from the French by a Sister of the Community of S. Mary.

YOU have asked me to let you know what I have learned from my experience as a confessor in regard to the mystical life. This is what I may say.

There is, as you are aware, a very popular theory to the effect that every one is called to the practice of mystical prayer. According to this theory, the only difference between the simple act of faith and the spiritual marriage is one of intensity. According to the opposite theory, mystical prayer is an extraordinary prayer that God does not vouchsafe to all.

It is not easy to decide between these two theories, but my experience has at last forced me to accept the second one. Beyond all doubt, there does exist a state of extraordinary prayer whose beginning is marked by what is usually known as the dark night of the senses. Up to this point there is meditation, there is affective prayer, there is even from time to time the prayer of simplicity which may include the prayer of simple regard, and passive or active contemplation. Indeed I consider this last prayer is only an extremely simplified form of affective prayer. With the dark night of the senses everything changes. The soul is gradually possessed of a new spirit, and follows a prayer in which there is direct experience of God. This is a doubly gratuitous gift, for it is both a supernatural grace, and the ground of special vocation.

Although among mystics there are many pronounced differences of character, talent, education, and special vocation, yet they possess certain traits in common that taken together make up what we recognize as the mystic temperament. Mystics are souls with wings. They fly while other folk are forced to walk on the earth. Many ardent, generous souls have only ordinary graces, and although they have a sincere desire for perfection, and make real efforts to attain it, they continually fall back into the same faults. These souls find the struggle for perfec-

* This letter was published in the *Revue d'Ascetique et de Mystique* of July, 1920, and forms part of a series of letters from eminent directors, whose names are for obvious reasons withheld from publication.

tion terribly difficult, for their trials seem to shake their spiritual life to its very foundation. When, however, God has favored souls with mystical prayer, they soar above the vicissitudes of life, and find no difficulty at all in sacrifices before which other souls quail. They feel the pain, but they possess the uplifting power of a strength unsuspected by others. And so their love is generous, and heroism is second nature to them.

Added to their heroism, mystics have perfect sincerity and deep spiritual insight into all that concerns perfection. Such souls may have little education, and may even in ordinary matters be somewhat stupid, but, as soon as you explain to them the path of the counsels, they will not only grasp the heart of the matter, but will seize at once upon even the subtlest shades of meaning. Unskilled in the affairs of life in the world, they seem to possess an instinct for the things of the spirit for they carry within themselves an inner light.

Another most striking characteristic of mystics is their perfect obedience. It may at times be difficult to make them understand, but never to make them obey. Their confessor cannot watch his words too carefully for they will follow scrupulously his slightest suggestion. It is unnecessary either to console these souls or to urge them on; it is sufficient to direct them. The Holy Spirit has Himself undertaken to fill them with courage and inspiration; and so all merely human consolation and outward signs of sympathy are unnecessary. But they do need from their confessor understanding, and clear, definite direction.

I have noticed also that mystics, when they feel the first touch of the Spirit, are, as a rule, seized with a sort of shyness which makes them hide from every one the "secret of the King." To their confessor alone they open their souls as a matter of humility, prudence, and obedience, but even this costs them great effort. Personally I have always felt that this reserve is most fitting, and a sure indication of the visitation of the Spirit. A loquacious mystic, eager to pour out wondrous experiences, is apt to leave me rather skeptical. It seems like a lack of that essential quality,— humility. With the humility of mystics every one is familiar. The kind of prayer they follow involves a degree of light that compels them to see only

too clearly their faults and imperfections,—what they frequently call their "corruption."

While the characteristics I have mentioned are found in all mystics, the mystics themselves are of various kinds,—joyous, suffering, or else,—not to be classed under either head,—originals. The joyous mystics, as I have called them, experience much delight in their union with God, and while they pass through purifying trials, they enjoy abundant consolation. This type of mystic is comparatively easy to understand, and has been frequently and fully described.

The mystics for whom their prayer brings suffering, possess even with their suffering that peace that must belong to any soul in the way of perfection; but to these souls God reveals Himself as an importunate Lover Who demands their all. These are the victims whose vicarious sufferings expiate the sins of others in whose place they offer themselves. Theirs is a veritable crucifixion of the spirit, and perhaps their deepest pain arises from the fact that any consolation that comes from others only hurts them. God is for them a jealous God filling the inmost depths of their souls and effectually preventing any rest or peace in aught but Himself. For them all pleasure is stayed at the threshold, while suffering enters freely. This utter detachment from all created beings is at once terrifying and sanctifying. Indeed this form of the mystical life baffles even directors at times for they do not always understand how it is that souls apparently so close to God can yet have so austere a vocation.

That strange group of mystics that I have called "originals" have the wonderful inspiration that normally marks the mystic, and they have also that inner light on the way of perfection that always accompanies the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. But to the end of their lives they remain children; they never really grow up. God is their Divine Playmate, and they His toys. S. Francis of Assisi with his improvident generosity and sweet naiveté is their patron. With these "children of a larger growth" a director must insist on prudence and restraint, but never can he make them cease to be children and "different." These souls have not the slightest aptitude for practical affairs, no executive ability. It is foreign to their temperament and vocation. They are apostles, penitents, men of prayer,—yet

even this after their own fashion, a little odd, a little eccentric, like themselves. Yet in spite of their eccentricity, they are characterized by the perfect docility and humility common to all mystics, and will obey implicitly the slightest suggestion from the director. It is easy to see that these souls at once so sublime and so childlike are of all mystics the most difficult to understand. They are so unlike the orthodox type. S. Francis was considered mad, and few know how to discern the depth of mysticism beneath the surface eccentricities in those who are today his spiritual kindred. It is true also that many souls with the strongest vocation to mystical prayer do not at all desire it. They would rather that God would let them walk in the ordinary paths. The touch of mystery makes them afraid, and they must be encouraged to follow this strange invitation of God. Those, on the other hand, who eagerly desire mystical prayer are apt to have a very different vocation.

Not only are there two theories in regard to the vocation to extraordinary prayer, but there are two also concerning even the desire for extraordinary graces. Some writers hold that all should ask for them since they are in themselves a powerful means of sanctification; but souls that have not as yet received extraordinary grace gain nothing by dallying with these desires. Since they know mystical prayer only from the outside, they see only that outward aspect of it which leads the imagination to see vain things, and to dream of wondrous intercourse with God. And so they risk finding the exercise of every-day virtues very dull, and the common duties of life uninteresting. They lose, too, a vast amount of time in introspection and self-analysis, trying to discover in themselves the phenomena described in books on mysticism. When a soul has been called to extraordinary prayer these dangers are practically non-existent since every extraordinary grace brings its own safeguards in the inner light it enkindles, and in the humility that utterly prevents all vainglory. This is an added reason why mystics need neither consolation nor encouragement from their director. The Holy Spirit has already inspired them with strength and devotion, and from the confessor they ask only understanding and clear, definite direction. All doubtful and hesitating direction is to them a torment.

P. S. There exists a strong prejudice to the effect that mystics are almost always women, and not only women, but nuns, contemplatives, and even neurotics. This is not true. Two of the most marked vocations to mystical prayer that I have known, I have found in men who belong to an active order, and are in perfect health. Two others, whom God has called not only to a state of extraordinary passive contemplation, but to a high degree of mystical union, are mothers of families. These souls are certainly not weak either in intellect or will-power. They are valiant souls,—apostles—as devoted outwardly to the service of their neighbors, as they are inwardly united to God.

Monseigneur Duchesne and Modernism

Cecil Roberts

"ONE of the most learned men of the world", Lord Acton had adjudged Duchesne as early as 1896, and in 1913 Dr. Gooch still could write "The greatest living Catholic scholar is Duchesne." In April of the present year, at the age of seventy-nine, Mgr. Louis Marie Olivier Duchesne, Member of the French Academy and Director of the French School of Archæology in Rome, passed to his well earned rest, and the entire world of historical scholarship, Catholic and Protestant alike, is the poorer for his death. Anglicans have especial reason to be grateful to him because of his advocacy of our Orders during the famous papal inquiry of 1896, and for this account as well as for his unrivaled preeminence in the field of ecclesiastical history, these words of respect and memory may not be out of place.

Dr. Duchesne was born so long ago as 1843 not far from the English Channel, at St. Servan in Brittany, and after the usual clerical studies came under the influence of De Rossi, the pioneer revealer of the glorious mysteries of the Roman catacombs. It was while working through De Rossi's *Roma Sotteranea* that young Duchesne found his own vocation as an explorer of Christian origins. So close did the intimacy between master and pupil become that only a few years later, De Rossi could say "I write nothing without asking myself, what will Duchesne think of it?"

In 1878, after some preliminary studies in the sources of the *Liber Pontificalis*, Duchesne became professor of ecclesiastical history at the newly founded Catholic Institute in Paris. Almost at once he gathered a group of enthusiastic pupils in his train, many of whom (Loisy, Turmel, Tixeront, and Batiffol) were themselves to become famous from one angle or another in the theological revival in the French Church at the turn of the century. As Batiffol has put it, "At this time a young professor began his teaching: to speak more exactly, a teaching began with him."

Duchesne remained at the Institute until 1895, and then upon nomination of the French government became Director of the

French School at Rome. This position, with his quarters in the historic Farnese Palace, just above the French embassy, he retained until his death.

Duchesne's writings dealt with many of the most important and most controverted problems in Church history. To the study of the papacy, he contributed his monumental edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* (1885ff.), *The Churches Separated from Rome* (1896), and *The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes* (1898). While the second of these was for the general reader, the first and third were immediately recognized as standard studies in the very darkest periods of Church life. Toward the history of his own national Church, he offered his work of untold diligence, the *Episcopal Lists of Ancient Gaul* (3 vols. 1894ff.). In this he not only annihilated those lovely legends of Old Provence, in which Lazarus and the Maries and Martha figure as the apostles of French Christianity, but he caused even more surprise by showing that well on toward the end of the second century, St. Irenaeus was probably the only bishop in all Gaul, north of the Mediterranean coastline. In 1889 had appeared the *Origins of Christian Worship,* which traced in clear fashion the early history of worship in the Western Church, and pointed out the historical variations and present dislocations in the Canon of the Roman Mass, so pointedly indeed that a few Anglicans were the only ones left to continue to regard it as an ideal. Finally, beginning with 1905, came the three volumes of the *Early History of the Church* in which the traditional twenty-five years' episcopate of St. Peter in Rome was discarded, and the general evolution of early Christianity as outlined by German scholarship was distinctly, though independently, followed.

From the start of his academic career, Duchesne worked under suspicion by the obscurantist party in the Roman Church. His first studies in the *Liber Pontificalis* were delated to the Index, but the loyal support of Mgr. D'Hulst, the large-hearted rector of the Institute, protected him. Of course his treatment of the early legends of the French Church was taken as a national ecclesiastical insult, even treason, and as early as 1886 the seminarians of Saint Sulpice were forbidden to attend his lectures.

His pupils have often dwelt upon his "pitiless severity" toward historical facts, and his "terrible wit" toward ecclesiastical personages. It was as the sun dispersing a fog to have Duchesne enter a controversy. Those who preferred darkness rather than light were rendered impotent and frantic by the pitiless light of scientific knowledge which Duchesne brought to bear. As old Cardinal Franzelin complained, "Duchesne's teaching did not at all borrow the Roman method of interpreting the Fathers, but preferred a method borrowed from the German universities." Yet it was really Duchesne's style as much as his conclusions which offended many. He was a master of irony, and his utter contempt for dishonest defences of Catholicism gave vast scope for this dangerous gift. Imagine for instance the bewildered irritation of an ardent papalist at such a passage as this, where Duchesne is speaking of the Lombard king Liutprand and his erstwhile enemy Pope Zachary. "At the beginning of the next year, 744, the long and glorious reign of Liutprand came to an end. Impertinently enough, Zachary's biographer attributes his death to the prayers of the Pope, who had had so much reason to be grateful to him. We must, however, for Zachary's honour, look upon this as the slander of an unprincipled eulogist." (Temp. Sov. p. 11). Or again, later in the same account, when Pope Stephen III, after having murdered one predecessor and having blinded another, goes through a mock ceremony in St. Peter's, Duchesne's only comment is "The very angels must have smiled at the hypocritical litanies chanted over them" (p. 80). His famous tenth chapter in Vol. 1 of *Fastes Episcopaux*, on the Provençal legends, will long remain a masterpiece of historical controversy—none the less deadly in effect because of its urbanity. What Fr. Waggett has said of Scott Holland might equally apply to Duchesne. "Tell him that you do not care whether a thing is true or not, so long as it is charming; say in an accent of religion or in the name of the Church that you have parted with free choice, that you are afraid of using your judgment; that you suppose all things will come right if, without the effort of intelligence and the effort to know, you trust yourself to some stream of tendency not yourself that makes for righteousness.

Turn you shall see Rome" (Duchesne, *apud* Pope Henry Fourth Holland, p. 135).

Finally, in the Modernist troubles under Pius X, even the many and powerful friends whom Duchesne had always enjoyed could no longer save him from the anti-Modernist propaganda. Though the scholarly Jesuit Bollandists had supported him in his attack upon the start of the Church in Provence, and though Thurston's interest had made him a Doctor on account of his Early Church History, it was now discovered that in this latter there was much heresy. Duchesne defended himself in his Confidential Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church, in which he emphasized the fact that the attacks made upon him rested upon an utter travesty of his real views. Nevertheless, the pot of antagonism of years previous, and in 1912 the History was placed upon the Index.

Thus was Duchesne burdened with that ever larger company of devout Roman Catholic scholars, who have had to sacrifice their standing to their Churchmanship. Not to go back of Henry Hefele at the Vatican Council, Kraus and Funk in Germany, Acton and von Hügel in England, Bellot and Tournebize in France have all had to suffer, be it noted, because of their strong Catholicism. It would have been quite easy for any of them to have obtained popularity and preferment as Liberal Protestants. This they refused to do, and rather made the greatest sacrifice which it is possible for a Catholic scholar to make, viz. the submission of his own conclusions to the judgments of the Holy. When we consider these men, genuinely Catholic and genuinely modern, the group in our own Church which applies to itself the title "Modernist" presents a sorry sight. As weak in scholarship as in Churchmanship, the American Modernists would have offered a choice object for Duchesne's sarcasm. As one of the greatest of the Roman group has put it: "Whatever Jesus was, he was not a Liberal Protestant." Perhaps before very many years have passed the American Modern Churchmen's Association may have caught up, if not in scholarship at least in sentiment, to the position reached by Catholic critics some dozen years ago.

Book Reviews

The Church in America. By William Adams Brown, Ph.D., D.D. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. xv+378. $3.00.

Dr. Brown begins by surveying the religion of the average American. He takes up the boys in the war, older men, American women, and the children. He finds that the soldiers believed in God and immortality, respected religion, carried with them Bibles or other religious objects, but knew little about their religion and had little denominational loyalty. " If all observers agree that the young men in the American army were religious, there is equal agreement that the religion which they had was exceedingly vague and undeveloped. Not only did the differences between the different churches play a small role, but even the differences between Christianity and other religions " (p. 19). Among Roman Catholics and Lutherans there was more evidence of religious instruction, which, in the case of the Lutherans, seemed to be due to their careful preparation for confirmation.

Older men are estimated as more conservative and more interested in their denominations. It is felt that the new attitude assumed by women will lead women to seek more direct control in church affairs. As to the children, " there is the breaking up of family life, with a consequent decay of religion within the home " (p. 31).

As regards this appraisal we believe that Doctor Brown is entirely true to the facts. We also believe the meaning of these facts is that Protestantism is dissolving into Liberalism and that America, like Protestant countries in Europe, is rapidly becoming a pagan nation. Not so thinks Doctor Brown. He accepts the situation with what we must consider an idle optimism. Naturally he sees dangers and suggests remedies. On the whole, however, we think he betrays that he himself is a part of the religious disintegration which he so clearly describes.

The " emerging problems " affecting the situation, which come next, the shift in population, northerly exodus of the negroes, and labor-class-consciousness, are not religious problems at all. They are economic and political problems. Doubtless, however, if religion had disintegrated, the economic storms may threaten to blow down the rotten tree. That is what Dr. Brown's evaluation of the problems amounts to, although he would probably abhor our way of expressing it. Dr. Brown feels that the Church should interest itself in the social problem in order to hold

the workmen. A complete answer to this idea seems to us to be the following question:

Should the Church as such, favor or oppose the Plum-plan of railway operation?

Perhaps Dr. Brown will agree with us that no Church can lay down a dogmatic decision on the Plum-plan of railway operation as *de fide*. But if the Church cannot speak on a comparatively simple and well defined economic question like this one, what business has the Church with this sort of problems? Indefinite sympathy and so forth is likely to stimulate revolutionary tendencies. That is all that it is likely to do. If American Protestantism has not been able to teach its own proper subject, definite religion, to the young men of America, what hope is there that the churches will be able to teach the young men those political and economic truths about which there is not very much reason to believe that the Protestant churches know very much more than the young men themselves know.

The chapter on the wider outlook touches on missions, but it touches on ever so much more; on relief work; on international justice; on the League of Nations. Dr. Brown seems to think that creeds can be neglected for morals, though he does not tell us what is to support morals except creeds. He seems to feel sure that the League of Nations is a great moral issue, though he does not seem to realize that there is at least as much difference of opinion on the League of Nations, among high minded American gentlemen, as there is on any article of the creed. The League of Nations is an excellent proof that moral questions are just as controversial as theological questions.

Dr. Brown spends some time on a description of American Protestantism and of the Church's work in the war. He finds, we think truly, decentralization a mark of all American Church organizations, even of the Episcopal Church. How war-emergency called a certain amount of centralized administration into existence for war-purposes is interesting. It shows, we think, the business ability of the American people. Dr. Brown thinks the young men went to war for religious motives. "Who can doubt that to thousands of our young men the call to service was in a true sense the call of religion?" (p. 93). This sentence exemplifies that strange paganism which has taken possession of Protestantism, according to which every emotion, not demonstrably either sensual or selfish, is "in a true sense" religion.

The war ended, the war-organizations were rapidly dissolved, and

things tended back to the decentralized conditions and the divided denominational situation, as before the war. This would not satisfy, however, the war-workers and all that class of high salaried pagans for whom the colloquial name "uplifter" has been invented. Dr. Brown admits that the war inspired this class of people (Dr. Brown says, the Churches themselves) "with extravagant hope." So, to conserve the humanitarian enthusiasm of the war, there was launched "The Inter-Church World Movement," just as the League of Nations was launched to conserve the democratic achievements of the war. Both movements failed, at any rate so far as America was concerned. Dr Brown is very just in his estimate of the causes of failure of the Inter-Church World Movement. He admits there were many partial causes, but the first great reason "was the failure to take account of the strength of the denominational spirit in the country; the second was the inability to foresee the widespread moral re-action into which the sudden cessation from the strain of war would plunge the nation and the Church" (p. 119).

We would put it a little differently, of course. We would say that the first great reason was failure to take account of the strength of orthodoxy, which must fight for its life against any scheme of union that is not based on a whole-souled acceptance of orthodoxy itself. We would say that the second reason was a complete failure to distinguish between patriotism and Christianity. The war was a question of patriotism. Church problems after the war are, more or less, a question of Christianity. It is just a mark of the new Protestant paganism, as it has always been of all paganism, to identify patriotism and religion, however.

Dr. Brown refers to the decline in candidates for the ministry and the decline in the educational standards of the ministry. Here, again, he puts his finger on the difficulty. The trouble is not really financial. "Conditions have been created which have made it difficult for a man of initiative and ability to find adequate scope for his powers" (p. 130).

What is the task of the Church today? To express in forms adapted to democratic society the type of Christian faith and experience proved by the free test of experiment: that is, Liberal Protestantism (p. 140). Secondly, to organize ideals and leadership for the democracy of the present day. "We have been studying the American Church not for its own sake simply, but to understand its contribution to the larger democratic experiment" (p. 353). These are the tasks of the American churches, as Dr. Brown sees the thing.

Our author takes up the new intellectual problems, where the limita-

tions of science at last coming to be recognized give less trouble to theology than formerly. Next comes the Church and the New Social Order. Here an effort is made to make emotion serve for reason: the remedy is love, as though economic questions could be decided by something other than justice. Church unity is discussed, but of course the Protestant unity in diversity is aimed at. Just as this indefinite social program leaves out justice, so this indefinite program for unity leaves out truth.

Finally parts IV and V of the volume deal with the practical problems of organizing for work, both locally and nationally, and of training the leaders of democracy.

We believe that Dr. Brown has ably expressed in this book the present survey and future program of Liberal Protestantism in America. He has estimated the difficulties of the program, among them the opposition of Protestant orthodoxy, which he always refers to as denominationalism. The interest of his book develops in democracy quite as much as in religion. This, to our mind, sufficiently reveals the essential paganism of his point of view. Yet on questions of fact, as distinct from values, we find ourselves entirely in agreement with the author.

FREDERICK SHERMAN ARNOLD.

A Call to Reunion. By Viscount Halifax. London: Mowbray, 1922; pp. vii+57; 2/—.

Unity and Rome. By Edmund S. Middleton. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. xvi+268; $1.75.

The Congregational Concordat adventure towards a pseudo church unity seems to have come to an end both sad and farcical. Its promoters rushed our rulers into legislation which would commit the American Church to a betrayal of faith and order. The agitation has saddened and disturbed thousands of our own communion. Examination of the attempted legislation proves it to have been both incomplete and uncanonical, and the leading Congregational periodical brands it as futile and unacceptable in any event, and considers the negotiations definitely at an end. One is tempted to hope that we may have at least a temporary respite from unity projects based on abandoning such portions of the Catholic religion as our Protestant brethren find unpalatable, that we may the better give attention to work for reunion with the rest of the Catholic Church. Our overtures towards those who reject the Catholic creeds, sacraments and ministry having come to nothing, perhaps we

shall give more thought to those who agree with us on these rather fundamental matters.

Mutual understanding between Anglicanism and the East is progressing at a rate beyond all hopes. But it still takes courage for an Anglican to hint that there may be a possibility that some day we may come to an understanding with that part of the Church from which we are descended and from which we were torn in the sixteenth century. The Lambeth Fathers showed such courage. And now we have two books which are lessons in the method of approach to the subject of church unity. Lord Halifax, in spite of his great age and the sad rebuff which he received in 1896, is as full as ever of zeal and enthusiasm for the great cause to which he has devoted so much of his life—the reunion of England and Rome. This time his efforts have taken the form of conferences (quite unofficial, of course) with Cardinal Mercier. These conferences are reported in the little book before us. Nothing could be finer than the spirit they show, and we believe they do very much to justify his conviction " that the questions which now divide us, and which appear to be unsurmountable while we hold aloof from one another, will be found to be less formidable when discussed face to face, and approached in a spirit of Christian charity." There is genuine eloquence in his review of the sad results of disunion and in his *apologia* and farewell to his fellow Churchmen.

Our second book is by a priest of our American Church. He devotes his first 94 pages to an exposition of the evils resulting from disunion and to his thesis, which is, briefly, " that there can be no true unity without Rome ", and that in any discussion " Rome must take the first place, because it is hers of divine right." The remaining and larger part of the book is taken up with the testimony of history, the Fathers and the councils, as to the necessity of unity, the apostolic ministry and the place of the Holy See.

Truly we stand in awe of the courage of these two writers, and especially of the latter: for Lord Halifax is a layman and rather out of reach of his attackers. But it is easy to foresee the storm which will fall upon the head of Dr. Middleton. He foresees it himself and says that he is ready to endure.

We hope that these two essays toward a *Catholic* unity will stir up much plain speaking and plain, unmuddled thinking. Anglo-Catholicism needs, when the Roman issue is raised, a thorough examination of conscience. Did our Lord's startling commission to Peter mean what the

words appear to mean and what even the primitive church certainly understood it to mean? We know one New Testament critic who says: yes, the traditional meaning cannot be questioned, but the Petrine texts are to be thrown out bodily as interpolations. We fancy this convenient method of disposal will not go down with most of us. And what about the style of English church history on which most of us were raised and which some of us still propagate? That clause in Magna Carta, *e.g.*, " that the church of England *be free* ": shall we continue to imply that this was an early disowning of papal jurisdiction, a prediction of the present happy freedom of the English Church, achieved in the glorious sixteenth century, illustrated today by an episcopate appointed by a Baptist prime minister? Did our " Reformation " come about by an uprising of an indignant people against superstition and papal usurpation? Or was it really the product of the lust and cruelty and greed of a comparatively few evil men, and forced upon a terrified and unwilling people? And finally, when we say daily our collect for unity, do we really mean peace and unity—of the whole of Christ's Catholic Church? Or should we add, as a saving clause, " from the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, Good Lord deliver us "? H. K. P.

Life and Letters of W. J. Birbeck, M.A., F.S.A., Magdalen College, Oxford. By His Wife. With a Preface by Viscount Halifax. With Illustrations. New York: Longmans, Green, 1922; pp. xv+390. $5.00.

This is the biography of a staunch and consistent Catholic Churchman, of one whose Catholicity began with the dawn of his intelligence and expanded with the growth of his knowledge, of one whose belief in the essential Catholicity of the Anglican Church never wavered. That belief, by the circumstances of his life, was constantly put to the test, the test primarily of his growing knowledge of the universal Church, a test which is often a severe trial to the Anglican mind. Birbeck's understanding of Anglican principles was clear and deep enough to enable him to appreciate their entire harmony with the mind of the Catholic Church in all ages. In Lord Halifax's words: " His historical knowledge was as wide as it was reliable, and as a theologian none could question the accuracy of his learning."

Birbeck was born in 1859. He entered Eton at the age of thirteen and had not been there long before his Churchmanship attracted notice. Clewer was close at hand, and it was there that the boy found help and

comfort in his faith. There was not much of either in a religious way at Eton. One of Birbeck's school-fellows writes: (p. 8)

We both learnt our religion from going to the children's service at St. Stephen's, Clewer. As there was only a monthly (late) Mass at the College Chapel, we always went to the eight o'clock one at St. John's, Eton. Johnny was one of the boys who petitioned the then headmaster for an early celebration once a month in the College Chapel, and the sympathetic answer they got was a blunt refusal—"I cannot encourage superstition."

On leaving Eton he went to Oxford over the protest of one of his tutors: (p. 9)

I myself fear for him as regards Oxford, and wish to ask if you have quite made up your mind to send him there. With his susceptible feelings with regard to religion and music, and with no substratum of diligence and obedience, is there not reason for fear that he may grieve you by taking up extreme views? At Cambridge the influences would be different altogether. May I ask you to weigh this well, and if you are not much acquainted with the present state of Oxford, to ask the advice of some of your friends who are?

What would the Anglican Church be without those who fear "extreme views"? Surely a much less exhilarating field of labor!

Early in his life Birbeck's attention was turned to Russia and the Rusian Church, and the subject so absorbed his interest that a greater part of his life was given to the work of explaining the Orthodox Church to the English and the English to the Orthodox. He travelled largely in Russia with a view to seeing Russian life from all angles, and wrote constantly of his experiences in the English press. He was easily first of Englishmen in his knowledge of Russian life and religion, and his efforts to bring about a better understanding between the two nations and the two Churches was keenly appreciated in Russia. He became a familiar figure in Russia, and widely known to the Russian public through the translation of his writings. Of his visit to Russia in 1912 he writes: "Our reception here has been quite extraordinary. One could not have believed it. And I come in for rather a double share, because they say that I was their friend *before* the English and Russians had come to see that they after all need not hate each other. I was received in the station with shouts of 'our old friend,' 'Our Ivan Vassilievich,' and one is hugged and fêted everywhere one goes. It is a new sensation, being cheered in the streets, as one has been several times!" This appreciation extended to the throne itself. "The Emperor was quite delightful on Friday, and told me he wished to see me

again before I leave Russia. He said, 'You are such a friend of our Church, you know it better than most Russians, much better than I do myself. Everybody likes to see you here.' "

In 1903 Birbeck accompanied Bp. Grafton of Fond-du-Lac on his trip to Russia, and enjoyed his association with the bishop extremely. "It is such a blessing to have a bishop who knows how to behave like a bishop, and does what he ought to icons and relics, and I am sure he is making a splendid impression." And again: (p. 250)

Carriages and Abbots came to meet us at the station this morning, expecting us to arrive; and we are invited tomorrow to Troitza for St. Sergius Day as guests of the monastery; after which they invited us to stay in the Metropolitan's rooms in the Chudoff Monastery in the Kremlin! Nothing like so much has been done before for any of our Bishops; asking him to stay in a monastery is what they do for their own Bishops, and is tantamount to acknowledging Bishop Grafton as such. And the Chudoff, too—a monastery which has played such a great part in Russian history, and where the relics of St. Alexis of Moscow repose! Of course, too, it will be quite thrilling for him to say our liturgy under that roof!

Naturally, Birbeck's chief interest was the possible reunion of Christendom, especially the reunion of the Orthodox and Anglican Churches. How he would have rejoiced if he had lived to read the letter of the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Archbishop of Canterbury! He found much comfort and encouragement in his intercourse with the Orthodox authorities, as the following quotations show (page 140):

I have had two long interviews with the Metropolitan Palladius, of St. Petersburg, the President of the Holy Synod, and he was *most* kind and very keen indeed about reunion with *Rome*, which he says cannot be thought of until the Pope will acknowledge a General Council to be a higher authority than himself. As long, he says, as Rome will not acknowledge this, the Eastern Church cannot even discuss the subject, as from their point of view it is an abnegation of any belief in the Church at all, and they have no common ground to begin upon any more than with German Protestantism, which likewise rejects the authority of the Church, in favor of the private interpretation of the Christian faith either by individuals or the heads of States. "But," he said, "I have examined the writings of English theologians, and they do acknowledge the authority of General Councils as a principle, and through mutual explanations we might agree as to *what* Councils we acknowledge.

(P. 115):

I perfectly understand what you say in your letter about Rome, and about the relations of the English Church and of the English people toward her. It is difficult for you, as it is for all Western nations, to

get away from Rome or pass her over, for *history* unites you to her, and history and a life led together, is a great thing. The traditions of that common life, and of a common culture, civil and religious, derived from Rome, unite you to her, whereas between you and the East lies a gulf—a gulf of ignorance, prejudice and estrangement—a gulf which time alone can fill up or build a bridge across for mutual intercourse and understanding of one another. And the Pope is for you a former spiritual authority, which has not been yet dethroned in the West, and still preserves its aureole; whereas for us the Pope never was an authority in a spiritual sense, while in a political sense he was the supporter and instigator of our enemies.

In the intervals of his Russian experiences he was immersed in ecclesiastical affairs at home. The details of the contest to sustain the Catholic position of the Church of England and the right to its children to Catholic belief and practice show clearly through his correspondence. His sympathies were Eastern rather than Western, and he did not always sympathize with the acceptance of Western developments, but he was unyielding on any question which had the note of ecumenicity. In such cases he was ready to fight the whole bench of bishops. He stood on his rights. "Nothing that any bishop would do or say would make me depart from the Church which is just as much mine as theirs." That has the right ring. And this is equally unequivocal (p. 216):

We must make it *quite* clear that we are not going to have all these details of ritual overhauled by the Bishops and compromised, just in order to save them from a little trouble and public odium. The latter I consider extremely good for them; as long as they sit on the top of the hedge, the more thorns that grow in it the better, and we have no sort of interest in making it comfortable for them. As for burning incense in a pot, Bishop Andrewes had absolutely no right to introduce any such tomfoolery into the Church of England. If incense is legal at all, it is only legal when used in the same manner as in 2 Edward VI.

That may seem a little extreme, but we remember that it is from a private letter, and one can understand the exasperation that results from dealing with men who, like Bp. Creighton, with his vast knowledge of history, could take so purely insular a position as this (p. 87):

He said that the Church was the Church of England, and that the English Church was fully prepared for an *Anglican* revival, carried out to its fullest extent, but was not yet prepared for a Catholic revival, as distinct from Anglican, and that therefore, although things like incense and Invocation of Saints might be Catholic, they must not be forced upon people who were not, and obviously could not be, prepared to accept them.

It ought to be obvious to anyone who knows the Catholic religion that there cannot be an Anglican religion, unless it is a purely sectarian religion.

The controversy over the Invocation of Saints absorbed much of Birbeck's energy. Here was a distinct attempt to hold an article of the creed and to deny the right of its use. The article of the Communion of Saints as held by many is the ideal example of what the opponents of Christianity call an "empty dogma." Catholics felt bound to express its meaning, and exercise their rights under it. This was regarded as "going too far." The *safe* position, one is surprised to find, was maintained by Dr. Liddon (p. 77):

I had, rather more than two years ago, a long talk with Liddon about this, and when he, although acknowledging the force of this argument, maintained that prayers addressed to God asking for the benefit of the intercession of the saints were safer, and that this was Dr. Pusey's position, I could not help saying that, as far as I could see, this distinction originated with and was invented by Dr. Pusey, and that if we believed in the Church at all, and then deliberately preferred the opinion of an Oxford Professor to the consistent practice of the whole Church for at least a thousand years, it seemed to me very much like making the word of God of none effect by the traditions of men. It seems to me that if the whole Church, East and West, for a thousand years fell into error, then indeed the gates of hell have prevailed against her. After all, however much we may owe to Dr. Pusey, he may have made mistakes sometimes; and if we must have a Pope at all, I for one should certainly prefer the *real* one, who, monstrous as some of his claims may be, at least occupies a See which was in existence in Apostolic times, which cannot be said either of Canterbury or of the Oxford Regius Professorships!

(Page 76):

But isn't it rather funny to speak of practices which were in use certainly for a century and a half before the conversion of the English and the foundation of the See of Canterbury as "variations from Anglican practice?" I should rather have said that Anglican practice during 330 years out of the 1,300 during which the *English* Church has existed has shown a notable variation in this respect from the rest of Catholic Christendom, as well as from its own practice during by far the greater period of its existence.

We may conclude with a comment on the position of another English Bishop, Dr. Gore: (p. 89):

Many thanks for your letter of the 21st. I agree with every word. Thanks, too, for letting me see the Bishop of Worcester's letter. I am always a little puzzled at his attitude towards the question of Invocation of Saints; but from that letter of his which the Romans got hold of

last autumn and have been using with such effect at Shoreditch and elsewhere, there is no doubt that he does feel very strongly on the subject, and that, in fact, if St. Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, or Ambrose had held curacies in his diocese, it might seem that they would by this time either have been gagged or forced to seek work elsewhere! J. G. H. B.

Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labors. By Shane Leslie, M.A. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1921; pp. xxiii+515. $7.50.

The initial statement in the preface to this stout volume is that the book "must appear as a supplement rather than a supplanter to Purcell's grandiose Life." Roman Catholics can hardly consider the latter as a "coup d'etat of the Lord God" but, as Mgr. Talbot sagely remarked, "a word dropped at the proper occasion works wonders", so perhaps the present work may help the world to find Manning's personality more palatable.

Mr. Leslie does not give us much of Manning's Anglican days; a more detailed account of these would have made the present volume better-balanced. But we see him at Harrow, where, according to Bishop Oxenden, his motto was, rather prophetically, "Aut Caesar, aut nullus" (his school-friends also called him "the General") and we find him later at Oxford in pink silk riding-breeches. As Vicar of Lavington and Archdeacon of Chichester we behold him wisely moderate and struggling between ambition and self-control, a struggle which we are told "was considerable." Certainly some of his diaries show deep self-examination. Persons who leave Canterbury and go to Rome and those who make the journey in the opposite direction are apt to have unpleasant things said about the period of transition. We are not especially interested in Purcell's charges of a lack of good faith on Manning's part, but he has given a much fuller account of this period than Mr. Leslie has. Manning's intellectual difficulties had not centered around Anglican Orders and it is rather surprising how quickly he disposed of these when the hour of his departure was at hand. This latter was of course occasioned by the incident of "le père Gorham."

"Had Manning not been a Catholic," observes Mr. Leslie, "he would have joined the Salvation Army." Never in the world! He would have become the most judicious of Anglican bishops, a stranger to all extremes.

Manning having departed from one part of the Catholic Church to another received a welcoming embrace from Cardinal Wiseman when the

trip was over and in a remarkably brief time was saying mass as a Roman Catholic and preaching. He couldn't do much in his Roman ardor with Florence Nightingale but he did a good deal about the Archbishop of Trebizond who was to have succeeded Cardinal Wiseman. Indeed, he was so busy in his new life that, as Mr. Leslie points out, " he confided his desire to retire to a Benedictine cell." But evidently everyone did not think him a suitable subject for such a vocation, for we recall that one of the Ushaw men said of him about this time " I hate that man, he is such a forward piece." Mr. Leslie records from the diary of June 4, 1865 " By nature I am very irascible." He also tells of an amusing meeting between Bishop Samuel Wilberforce and the new archbishop accompanied by his chaplain when the bishop made the query " And is that gentleman also an archbishop? "

The present volume tells us little of the voluminous correspondence carried on between Manning and Talbot who, as is well known, formed a sort of English channel affording a speedy passage to the continent—and the Pope's ear—of all British news.

It is difficult to know very much about what the writer thinks of the events connected with the Vatican Council as twenty pages are missing from the chapter devoted to this subject, but the author confidently informs us that it was " the honor of the Holy Ghost and the personality of Pius " that led Manning to take such a conspicuous part in the council. The latter had been a deep believer in Ecclesiastical Infallibility so that it was not so unnatural that after having become a Roman Catholic he became a staunch supporter of Papal Infallibility. One of the last utterances of Pius IX was " Addio Carissimo " to the former vicar of Lavington kneeling at his bedside.

The author tries apparently to balance Newman and Manning on either end of a metaphorical see-saw. Manning, we know, regarded the " old Catholic " with whom Newman sympathized " as one of the greatest evils in England " and accused Newman of " worldliness " and " disloyalty to the Pope," though at Newman's requiem he said in his sermon: " We have lost our greatest witness to the Faith." The two men so different temperamentally felt a mutual distrust of each other. Manning was a born leader and always self-assertive; he was not a deep thinker or a profound theologian but a most skilful ecclesiastical statesman, shrewd if hard. Newman's self-effacement was a part of his deep piety. His mind was very highly cultured and subtle and he was the artist and poet but never the papal politician.

Manning was always something of a Puritan and would have pleased the most eager American prohibitionist. He was rather severe with the theatre, declaring that in the majority of cases the co-respondents in the divorce court were of the theatrical world. He expressed the wish that a Salvation Army lassie would "persuade Catholics that the Holy Scriptures are not on the Index."

In spite of Cardinal Manning's egotism and love of power he was a man of pronounced ability: a remarkable administrator, wonderfully purposive and with much practical wisdom. His untiring energy might have shamed many ecclesiastics, Roman and Anglican, and the demonstration at his funeral was a witness to really great accomplishments.

G. P. C.

Saint Jeanne d'Arc, The Mystical Story of a Girl of the People. By Minna Caroline Smith. New York: The Macmillan Co.; 1922; pp. viii+373. $2.25.

We are grateful to an Anglican Catholic for this volume written with a fine appreciation of religious feeling. Persons who are wondering what to give some boy or girl as a Christmas present would do well to buy a copy of the book. It would teach the reader something about French history and Catholic religion; it would tell an inspiring story of adventure centering around one of the most appealing of romantic characters and, if the reader's studies included the French language, numerous names and expressions would prove a good test of his or her accent. The chapters are brief, the language is simple, with a good deal of conversation; there are several illustrations, and the binding is attractive. Finally some youthful Americans might memorize to their advantage words attributed to the staint which the authoress tells us school children in France learn by heart; "If I am in God's grace may He keep me there. If I am not may He put me there. I should be saddest in all the world were it not for the Love of God."

G. P. C.

The Public Conscience. By George Clarke Cox. New York: Holt, 1922; pp. xix+477. $3.00.

Heretofore there have been two ways in which questions of ethics could be approached. One was from the point of view of moral theology, a science based on the revealed moral law of God. Each separate case of human conduct would be scrutinized to see if it were in harmony with or in violation of the revealed will of God. This fact alone determined its rightness or wrongness. The other method of approach was from the

point of view of the natural science of ethics, which was based on moral standards that had become conventional with society and might be accounted for on the grounds of utilitarianism or patriotism or good citizenship. A human act, according to this science, was good or bad according as it did or did not minister in the main to the good of society. Both moral theology and ethics have always used the deductive method of reasoning, that is, they stated the general principles of right and wrong and examined the particular case to see how far it was consonant with those principles.

In *The Public Conscience* Mr. Cox has attempted to revolutionize our study of ethical questions by treating the whole subject inductively. It is the case system, now often used in the preparation of men for the legal profession, applied to the science of ethics. Mr. Cox says he is not at all concerned with general principles. He is not interested in the question of how people ought to act. His purpose in this study is to investigate through examination of their actual behavior what are the moral principles upon which men conduct their lives. He does not pretend in these pages to give us a survey of the whole field of ethics. After expounding his general principle he applies it merely to the limited fields of preservation of life and limb, preservation of property, security of life and property, and liberty. He selects his cases from the legal codes and judicial decisions bearing on these matters in the states of Massachusetts and New York. Thus he allows his readers to make their own inductions as to the kinds of killing practised in human society in these two states, the offenses of individuals against property, against security, and against liberty, and the legal or approved interferences with or restrictions of liberty.

It becomes evident in the first chapter that Mr. Cox does not believe in human free will. He believes that the actions of men are entirely determined by such factors as hereditary influences, economic surroundings, health, operations upon the skull, adenoids, diet and the Freudian wish. He says (p. 26), " The theory that, by an appeal to the will, or by the grace of God, the meanest wretch may turn to a life of righteousness and honor, vanishes in thin air." According to Mr. Cox's necessitarian philosophy we should suppose that the sense of oughtness also must vanish into thin air and along with it the conscience, whether individual or social. It seems a little surprising that he should use the term " public conscience " as the title of his book when he appears to deny the very essence of conscience, which is moral responsibility. It is, how-

ever, a good title, in accord with contemporary notions, and ought to help the sale of the book. Therefore, we may let that pass.

As to Mr. Cox's general principle, that the empirical methods used in such sciences as biology, anthropology, and economics, may be applied also to the study of human acts, we cannot help feeling that he is fundamentally in error. It is one thing to say that in the study of the habits of ants a scientist should patiently collect all the facts and then draw his own inductions. It is quite another thing to draw such inductions from human acts. If men are merely automata without free will, this would undoubtedly be the wisest method for the study of human acts. Mr. Cox believes that men are without free will, that their acts are irrevocably determined by all sorts of material and economic conditions. Therefore, from his point of view, he is in the right. But we question whether those who believe in free will will find his book of any great practical value. We who believe men are responsible beings endowed by God with the gift of free will and in consequence far removed from the animal creation, are indeed concerned with their actual behavior; but we are much more concerned with what ought to be their behavior. We are interested predominantly in the highest moral ideals and in the means of impressing them upon as many human beings as possible.

We do not understand why Mr. Cox should confine himself to legal decisions. Why should he not study all human acts as reflected in the daily press? Men kill and commit all sorts of crime for every conceivable motive. If the actions of men are controlled by inscrutable forces beyond their power to combat, then all these acts must be taken into account and should be quite as legitimate material for an ethical study as the judicial decisions which condemn some of these acts.

Furthermore, why does Mr. Cox limit himself to the legal pronouncements of New York and Massachusetts? Why not also China and Turkey and Iceland and Zanzibar? Human beings live in those places as well as in New York and Massachusetts. A science of human conduct that is worth anything must be based on all human acts everywhere. Does Mr. Cox regard the people of New York and Massachusetts as the most highly developed in the world? Who cares what they regard as legally punishable? A lawyer may be interested in such matters, or a college professor of ethics, but does anybody else really care? One is reminded of the remark of Dean Robbins at a farewell dinner to Dr. Slattery. After Dr. Slattery had been fulsomely eulogized in many speeches, Dean Robbins reminded those present that Dr. Slattery was

not going to heaven, but only to Massachusetts! Does it really make so much difference what New York and Massachusetts consider right and wrong? Oregon has made an interesting contribution to restrictions on liberty by prohibiting parochial schools. Kentucky refuses to allow evolution to be taught in its public schools. But why should the student of ethics or morals concern himself with such matters? The question is whether such legislation is right and just, either according to the revealed standards of Christian morality, or the generally accepted standards of utilitarian ethics. What God had revealed to be right must be always and everywhere right, whether in Massachusetts or South Africa or in the islands of the sea. If we are only interested in how men do act as a matter of fact we can have our curiosity satisfied every morning at the breakfast table by reading the daily newspapers. We do not need to study a case-book in ethics.

We regret that we are unable to applaud and endorse Mr. Cox's painstaking study. He has evidently given much thought and labor to the collection of his cases. It represents the patient accumulation of many years. It undeniably would prove useful for class-room work in courses on ethics. It is interesting as indicating the present stage of development of the legal conscience of a small section of the American public. But we are still sceptical as to the practicability of the laboratory method for the study of ethics.

The Gospel According to St. Luke. With Introduction and Notes. By Lonsdale Ragg, B.D. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1922; pp. 1ii+334. 15s net.

The general preface to the Westminster Commentaries declares the object to be "exegetical, to interpret the meaning of each book of the Bible in the light of modern knowledge to English readers. The Editors will not deal, except subordinately, with questions of textual criticism or philology; but taking the English Text of the Revised Version as their basis, they will aim at combining a hearty acceptance of critical principles with loyalty to the Catholic Faith."

The purpose thus announced is admirably carried out in the volume under review. It will not rank with Driver's *Genesis*—perhaps it is not on the same level as Rackham's *Acts* or Goudge's *First Corinthians*—yet it has a character of its own that will make it very welcome to the clergy and to many well-educated lay people. It has the merit, rare among commentaries, of being written in a clear and interesting style.

This may be due to the fact that it deals chiefly with the larger issues rather than with technical *minutiae*. There is nothing of that meticulous setting forth of variant opinions on minor matters, and their equally meticulous controverting, which are so useless and so wearisome for the ordinary reader. At the same time the author shows acquaintance with recent discussions of the Third Gospel and *Acts*, more particularly those of English scholars and of Harnack. He mentions but does not do justice to Prof. Cadbury's brilliant essay, which ought henceforth to make it impossible for anyone to argue from, the Lukan vocabulary to the medical profession of the writer. In truth, the deeper problems, such as those suggested by Lake and Jackson in the two volumes already issued of " The Beginnings of Christianity " are hardly touched. The thorough-going, penetrating, competent, and sane commentary on the Third Gospel is yet to be written. Meanwhile this wholesome, readable, and orthodox volume ought to be useful. A striking, unique, and altogether delightful feature is the constant reference to the paintings of great artists who have depicted the scenes so beautifully described by St. Luke. A word of commendation must be spoken for the excellent paper and legible type, and another for the small but clear map printed on the inside of the cover. C. C. E.

Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament. A Sermon. By the Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D. Published by the Author, Tilton, N. H.; pp. 19; 25c. each or six for $1.00.

As one might expect, Dr. Waterman has given us a sermon which is at once beautiful, helpful, and in the truest sense scholarly. It is scholarly, not because it is a *résumé* of the opinions of various eminent critics, but because it reveals in every line painstaking and thoughtful search of the Scriptures themselves. Would that more men that pretend to learning went to sources! He undertakes to make clear how, as St. Luke tells us, Our Lord could say, " It is written that the Christ should suffer and rise again the third day." He shows very impressively that the acts and sufferings of Old Testament heroes and the words of psalmists and prophets foreshadow the Person and work of Christ, and urges that these were so ordered by Divine guidance to this end. Some of us would probably prefer to say that the *records*, rather than the lives, of the men of old were thus inspired, but this is probably what Dr. Waterman means.

At any rate, it is this, we think it must be said, he proves, even if some of his arguments will not be convincing to all minds. No one can read this devout and admirable sermon without gratitude to the writer and a deepened sense of the value of the ancient Scriptures of the Church of God. C. C. E.

Books Received

The Public Conscience. By George Clark Cox. New York: Henry Holt, 1922; pp. xix+477. $3.00.

Christ and Colosse; or the Gospel of the Fullness. By Rev. H. H. Gowen, D.D. Milwaukee: Morehouse, and London: Skeffington & Son, Ltd., 1922; pp. 127. 3 shillings 6 pence.

Life and Letters of Janet Erskine Stewart. By Maud Monahan. New York: Longmans, Green, 1922; pp. xii+524. $5.00.

The Holy City. By Dorothy St. Cyres. London and New York: Longmans, Green, 1922; pp. 91. $1.75.

Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament. By Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D. Pamphlet may be obtained from Dr. Waterman, Tilton, N. H., at 25 cents each, six for $1.00, pp. 19.

Question Time in Hyde Park. Series IV. Christianity in History. By Clement F. Rogers, M.A. London: S. P. C. K., 1922; pp. 63.

Life and Letters of W. J. Birbeck, M.A., F.S.A. By His Wife. London: Longmans, Green, 1922; pp. xv+390. $5.00.

The Jesuits. By Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, S. J. New York: Encyclopedia Press, 1922; pp. xvi+937. $5.00.

Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion. By Baron Friedrich Von Hugel, LL.D., D.D. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1922; pp. xix+308; Price 6 shillings.

Unity and Rome. By Rev. Edmund S. Middleton, D.D. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. xvi+268. $1.75.

Old Testament Law for Bible Students. By Roger S. Galer. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. ix+194. $1.25.

Matter and Spirit. By Prof. James Bissett Pratt. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. ix+232. $1.50.

Is the World Growing Better? By James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D. New York: Macmillan, 1919; pp. vi+201. $1.00. (New Edition.)

The Divine Counsellor. By Martin J. Scott, S. J. New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1922; pp. xvii+155. $1.75 (Cloth), $2.50 (Leather).

The Word of God. By M. Francis Borgongini-Duca, S.T.D. Translated by Rev. Francis J. Spellman. New York: Macmillan, 1921; pp. 211. $2.00.

Pledges of His Love. By Rev. Shirley C. Hughson, O.H.C. West Park, N. Y.: Holy Cross Press, 1922; pp. 207.

The Victory Over Victory. By John A. Hutton, D.D. New York: Doran: 1922; pp. x+261. $1.75.

Pamphlets:

The Kyrie Book (Music for the Nine-Fold Kyries). By Henry Smith. London: The Faith Press, 1922: Price, 1 shilling 6 pence.

A Service for Infants. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd. Price, 9 pence net.

Evensong Explained. By W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D., D.C.L. London: S. P. C. K., 1922.

Our Beloved Dead. By Shirley C. Hughson, O.H.C. West Park, N. Y.: Holy Cross Press, 1922; 4 cents each, more than 25, 3 cents each.

Walter De Gray, Archbishop of York. By H. Lowther Clarke, D.D., D.C.L. London: S. P. C. K., 1922.

Auto-Suggestion and Religion. By H. C. Carter, M.A. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., 1922. 1 shilling.

In the Footsteps of the Master. (Sermon Outlines on S. Mark's Gospel.) By J. H. B. Masterman, M. A. London: The Church Family Newspaper and S. P. C. K. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. 125. $1.00.

The Monastic Chronicler and the Early School of St. Albans. By Claude Jenkins. London: S. P. C. K., and New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. 98. $1.40.